SANCTVS
SANCTVS
SANCTVS

The Oxford Library of Practical Theology

EDITED BY THE

REV. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A.

CANON AND CHANCELLOR OF S. PAUL'S

AND THE

REV. DARWELL STONE, M.A.

LIBRARIAN OF THE PUSEY HOUSE, OXFORD

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/sacramentofaltar0000revw

THE SACRAMENT OF THE ALTAR

BY THE REV.

W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A.

Canon and Chancellor of S. Paul's

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
39 Paternoster Row: London
New York and Bombay
1908

All rights reserved

TO THE REVERED MEMORY OF

H. WALTER SARGENT

AND OF PAST DAYS OF EUCHARISTIC WORSHIP

IN THE CHURCH OF S. JOHN BAPTIST

OXFORD

EDITORS' PREFACE

THE object of the Oxford Library of Practical Theology is to supply some carefully considered teaching on matters of Religion to that large body of devout laymen, who desire instruction, but are not attracted by the learned treatises which appeal to the theologian. One of the needs of the time would seem to be, to translate the solid theological learning, of which there is no lack, into the vernacular of everyday practical religion; and while steering a course between what is called plain teaching on the one hand and erudition on the other, to supply some sound and readable instruction to those who require it, on the subjects included under the common title 'The Christian Religion,' that they may be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh them a reason of the hope that is in them, with meekness and fear.

The Editors, while not holding themselves precluded from suggesting criticisms, have regarded their proper task as that of editing, and accordingly they have not interfered with the responsibility of each writer for his treatment of his own subject.

W. C. E. N.
D. S.

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
	INTRODUCTORY	1
I.	THE PRESENCE OF GOD	11
II.	THE PROMISE OF A SPECIAL PRESENCE	33
III.	THE MANNER OF THE PRESENCE	55
IV.	THE TYPE OF THE MANNA	84
V.	PREPARATION FOR HOLY COMMUNION	104
VI.	THE PREPARATION—*continued*	122
VII.	THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE	143
VIII.	THE LORD'S TABLE	173
IX.	EUCHARISTICAL ADORATION	191
X.	RITUAL	215
XI.	STEPS TO THE ALTAR	236
XII.	THE EUCHARIST AND HUMAN LIFE	259
	INDEX OF SUBJECTS AND AUTHORS	289
	INDEX OF PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE REFERRED TO	295

INTRODUCTORY

INTRODUCTION

It is difficult to secure toleration for a popular book on a great subject, or to secure attention for that which professedly deals with one aspect only of an important question.

And yet there are numbers of people who, wishing to be instructed, are yet deterred by the voluminous treatise which leaves no difficulty untouched, no by-path of the subject even unvisited, who are confused by constant appeals to authorities, and the judicial balancing of contrarient statements. In moral and religious questions, there are many who, having themselves neither the time nor the aptitude for investigation, wish to have results plainly set before them by those who have. And it would be an unfair criticism to charge with partiality or one-sidedness those who are not really bringing forward one view of the question only, but who for the sake of clearness and conciseness are putting forth the results without stating fully the evidence which, carefully balanced, leads to those results.

This is pre-eminently the case with the great

doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. Its literature is voluminous, the departments of investigation to which it leads interminable. Liturgiology is a science in itself. The history alone of the Eucharistic controversy is complicated and embittered with acrimony and prejudice. A subject for which men have been found willing, on either side of a subtle theological question, to lay down their lives, and which seems to have power even at the present day to stimulate passions, which only a change in public manners and customs keeps from their natural development at Smithfield, inspires in many people's minds a dread and a shrinking which keeps them back from a right and reverent examination of the great Christian privilege which belongs to them as Communicants.

We still seem to hear echoes of Hooker's weary complaint, '"This is My body" and "This is My blood" being words of promise, sith we all agree that by the Sacrament Christ doth really and truly in us perform His promise, why do we vainly trouble ourselves with so fierce contentions whether by consubstantiation or else by transubstantiation the Sacrament itself be first possessed with Christ or no? A thing which no way can either further or hinder us howsoever it stands, because our participation of Christ in this Sacrament dependeth on the co-operation of His omnipotent power, which maketh it His body and blood to us, whether with change or without alteration of the element such as

they imagine we need not greatly to care nor inquire.' [1]

'Why should any cogitation possess the mind of a faithful Communicant but this: O my God, Thou art true; O my soul, thou art happy?' [2]

And yet it is difficult to overestimate the loss which is taking place in the lives of many at the present day owing to the loose conception which they have of truth, and the imperfect realisation of their privileges as Church people. This state of mind is being sedulously fostered by a religion of undenominationalism; which regards dogma as dangerous and precision as solemn trifling; which is now fretting against the creeds, or any distinctive utterance of religious belief whatever. If it matters nothing as to a man's sincerity whether he believe rightly or wrongly, surely it cannot fail to affect profoundly his religious life and practice, whether or not he believe intelligently and fully the content and possibility of his privileges in the Catholic Church.

Added to this, a great danger is beginning to assert itself, as will be further explained hereafter. A habit is growing up of frequenting the Holy Eucharist without any real conception of what it means, or without any proper preparation for its devout reception.

If S. Paul were with us to-day, if he did not write quite so severe a letter as that which he wrote

[1] Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, v. lxvii. 6. [2] *Ibid.* lxvii. 12.

to the Corinthians alluding to their Eucharistic customs, he would, we may believe, have something to say to the much unintentional profanity and the uninstructed easiness of Church people. A great wave of æstheticism, which has reached very strongly the Nonconformist sects, is producing a form of ornate worship which means nothing and symbolises nothing, and which must inevitably tend to materialise divine worship instead of elevating it. Surely there is no need for fear or controversial bitterness in seeking to steady and guide our faith in the great doctrine of the Altar. An intelligent appreciation of what it means will show us more and more how much agreement there is among those who believe themselves to be most divided on this question. This was remarkably shown in a conference held at Fulham Palace in October 1900, when fifteen clergy and laity, some of whom might presumably have been supposed to differ widely and irreconcilably in their estimate of this mysterious Sacrament, yet found that, although not prepared for reasons given to formally adopt them as an expression of the mind of the Conference, yet seemed generally to agree in the substance and purport of the following word of Hooker:—

'It is on all sides plainly confessed, first, that this Sacrament is a true and real participation of Christ, who thereby imparteth Himself, even His whole entire Person, *as a mystical Head* unto

every soul that receiveth Him, and that every such receiver doth thereby incorporate or unite himself unto Christ as *a mystical member of* Him, yea of them also whom He acknowledgeth to be His own; secondly, that to whom *the Person of Christ* is thus communicated, to them He giveth by the same Sacrament His Holy Spirit to sanctify them, as it sanctifieth Him Which is their Head; thirdly, that what *merit, force, or virtue soever there is in His sacrificed Body and Blood*, we freely, fully and wholly have it by this Sacrament; fourthly, that *the effect thereof in us is a real transmutation of our souls and bodies* from sin to righteousness, from death and corruption to immortality and life; fifthly, that because the Sacrament being of itself but a corruptible and earthly creature must needs be thought an unlikely instrument to work so admirable effects in man, we are therefore to rest ourselves altogether upon *the strength of His glorious power*, Who is able and will bring to pass that the bread and cup which He giveth us shall be truly the thing He promiseth.' [1]

It would seem to be strangely out of place that so much bitterness should gather round Christ's own Sacrament of Love; when all devout believers in His promise are truly waiting still upon God to feed them in a heavenly and spiritual manner, even if they differ as to the mode in which His

[1] Hooker, *Eccles. Pol.*, v. lxvii. 7. See also *Report of a Conference held at Fulham Palace*, 1900, p. 93.

promise is carried out. But since the first Eucharistic sermon at Capernaum, when many were offended, even to the present day, men have seemed to think that God may not even be conceived to act in ways which do not commend themselves to the controversial trend of thought in those who think themselves to be His advocates. There is great need for patience and mutual forbearance one with another, while we see how God Who brings order out of confusion is able to provide here also that the very disproportion of exaggerated and strange doctrines shall serve to emphasise certain sides of the great central doctrine, which otherwise might have become obscured or forgotten, but which are gathered up and focussed by Him into the fullness of Eucharistic Truth. The Holy Eucharist is a memorial of the Sacrifice on Calvary; but it is a memorial which is more than a remembrance. The Blessed Blood and Body of the Lord are present in the heart of the devout Communicant, but more than this, they are conveyed to him in the Sacrament. The Bread and the Wine are bread and wine still after consecration, but they are something more; and all the painful controversy which has arisen as to such expressions as *trans*, *con*, *sub*, *in*, has served to keep alive the sense of proportion, and to prevent the overthrowing of the nature of a sacrament, by making it on the one hand a bare sign with no inward part, or, on the other hand, an inward Presence of which the outward sign has perished or ceased to be.

It may serve to a clearer understanding of the point of view here enumerated if the writer reproduces the statement of his belief submitted to the Conference at Fulham alluded to above :—

'I believe that the Holy Communion was ordained "for the continual remembrance of the Sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby"; and that this "remembrance" is in the first place a memorial before God, because "Christ instituted not only a remembrance of the Sacrifice to ourselves, but also a special mode of pleading it before God," whereby we offer the same Body once for all sacrificed for us, and the same Blood once for all shed for us, sacramentally present, to the Father. I believe that, inasmuch as the Holy Communion is a Sacrament, it has an outward and an inward part. But I am further instructed in the Church Catechism, that whereas Baptism has an outward sign, which is water, and an inward grace, which is new birth, Holy Communion has, which Baptism has not, an "inward part or thing signified," so that whereas the questions and answers which have to do with the essential nature of Baptism are *two*, those which have to do with the essential nature of Holy Communion are *three*. That is to say, there is the outward sign of Bread and Wine, and there are the spiritual benefits, which are the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, etc.; but there is also that which is lacking in Baptism, an inward part,

which is "the Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper"—a distinction which is represented in theological language by the *Sacramentum*, *i.e.* the Bread and Wine, substantially and really present; the *Res Sacramenti*, *i.e.* the "thing signified," which is the Body and Blood of Christ, which are "taken" as well as received, or in the words of Article XXVIII., "*given*, taken and eaten" —by the faithful in the Lord's Supper; and the *Virtus Sacramenti*, *i.e.* the spiritual feeding on Christ, whereby the faithful are made partakers of Christ, so that the gift bestowed in the Holy Communion is the Body and Blood of Christ which are present really and truly, but spiritually and ineffably under the outward, visible part, sign, or form of Bread and Wine. "The manner of the Presence is mysterious, ineffable and inconceivable by us, (as) it is in Heaven, and there only, that Christ is present according to the natural mode of His existence."

'I believe, further, that those who come to this Holy Communion with a penitent heart and lively faith are thereby made partakers of Christ, and are made one with Him; whereas the wicked and they that are void of faith, where it was possible to receive it *sacramentally* or *spiritually*, or *sacramentally* and *spiritually* both—receive it only sacramentally, *i.e.* "*so*" receive it that their sinful bodies are *not* made clean by Christ's Body, nor

their souls washed by His most precious Blood, that is, receive it to their condemnation, "not discerning the Lord's Body," and so in no wise are "partakers of Christ." In other words, they receive the Sacrament but not the virtue of the Sacrament.

'I believe, further, that although it is not in accordance with Christ's ordinance that the Sacrament should be reserved for the express purpose of being carried about, lifted up, or worshipped, yet that "Christ Himself, the inward part of the Sacrament, in and with the Sacrament, apart from and without the Sacrament, wheresoever He is, is to be worshipped," *i.e.* that "Christ Himself, really and truly but spiritually and ineffably present in the Sacrament, is therein to be adored."

'I believe, further, in the words of Mr. Keble, "It has so happened in the providence of God that the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist has never been subject to similar enactments (*i.e.* similar to the decrees of true œcumenical councils) until the eleventh or twelfth century, after the separation of East and West. Well therefore may each person, or each portion of the Church, for himself or itself, form strong opinions and express them strongly as God shall guide them on the several points involved in the doctrine; but to impose them as articles of faith, making those heretics who demur to them, they are not, I conceive, competent, except the point be such an one as can be shown to have been *unequivocally* received by the whole Church from

the beginning, such as *e.g.* the inspiration of Holy Scripture."'[1]

[1] *Report of a Conference held at Fulham Palace*, 1900, pp. 29-31. See Keble, *Letters of Spiritual Counsel and Guidance*, p. 212 (third edition).

CHAPTER I

THE PRESENCE OF GOD

'Ergone putandum est, quod vero Deus habitet super terram?'

'Rex Israel mutavit habitum Suum et ingressus est bellum.'

'UNION with God.'—This was the subject of the opening chapter in the previous volume of this series, which dealt with the Eucharistic mystery in the general history of the doctrine and administration of this great Sacrament. And the sense of the presence of God as answering to the craving of the human heart must form no less the first stage in this more personal and subjective treatment of the same great theme.

I

Have we lost something? Has man become less eager? When the way to God is more open in and through the Incarnation, do fewer seek to traverse the paths which lead into His presence? Enoch walked with God. Abraham stood before Him in intercession and converse, he heard His messages and carried out His commands. Moses talked with God as a man talketh to his friend. Prophets

stood before furious kings and braved their wrath in the simple confidence of God's felt and abiding presence. 'As the Lord God of Israel liveth, before Whom I stand.'[1] A presence of God, manifest and real, went up with Israel out of Egypt, and the presence of God rested in their camp. It was one of the things which they missed in their second temple, for which no glory of architecture could compensate them. The sacred Shechinah had gone, the inner shrine was empty.

But it is in the Psalms especially that we listen wistfully to expressions of whole-hearted contentment in the sense of God's nearness, or of a craving hunger for its fuller manifestation, which our cold hearts seem barely able to comprehend. 'My soul is athirst for God, yea even for the living God: when shall I come to appear before the presence of God?'[2] What a sob of intense desire vibrates through these passionate words. They are the words of one who has seen God, in whom faith has made the unseen visible, and hope has leaned upon the future until it has become the present.

It is only because we think so little of what we are saying that we are able to utter such words as these without a sense of shame at our unreality, and of despair at our utter incapacity to realise their meaning. This Jew whom we are so tempted to despise seems at least to have mastered a secret which fairly eludes and baffles us, the secret of living

[1] 1 Kings xvii. 1. [2] Ps. xlii. 2.

in the felt presence of God. It is still there, in this strange race, the yearning to get back, as the people of God, to the level from which they sprung, a yearning which has burst up from under the weight of oppression, and the barriers of captivity, into a force which will not be suppressed. It has been pointed out with great truth that 'none of the planted nations is attacked by a more passionate, a more sacred devotion to a particular soil,' than is the Jew, 'the imperishable wanderer of the earth'; and yet the association of this people with their land has never been more than a temporary one. 'They are no autochthones, children of the soil, whose memory cannot show them a time when they did not belong to it.'[1] Israel's first entrance into Canaan was a definite event in history; and for only two periods as a nation have they had a footing upon those waterless, barren hills. The traveller cannot conceal his disappointment as he visits it. Sunny Greece and stately Rome look in scornful disdain at the strange fascination which has so riveted the attention of the world on a spot so undeserving of admiration. Yet, so it is, that there lingers round the home of our religion, and the tabernacle where the Incarnate God rested, a fascination of memory and a glory of impression such as that which will make a man who has seen every beauty which the world can display, and tasted the variety of experience which it can offer

[1] Bevan, *Jerusalem under the High Priests*, p. 1.

him, still come back to the cottage home and the old fields and hills of his childhood, where

> 'Meadow, grove, and stream,
> The earth and every common sight did seem
> Apparelled in celestial light.'

The reason why the Jew loves his country and longs for it with such passionate devotion is because it is the place where his ancestors met God and reposed in His presence. And it is because we have followed in the path which they trod until we have found God Incarnate that we aspire to say the same Psalms, and breathe the same longings for the presence of God, the joy of His countenance, and the rapture of His smile.

We must do something to rescue this sense of the presence of God from the supposed unreality of an unpractical mysticism, which belongs only to a certain class of minds at once imaginative and visionary. In the same way, a man will listen to the raptures of a musician, couched in terms which he does not understand, and describing emotions which he does not feel; and he says, 'That man is an enthusiast. I am not musical, or at the best an amateur'; and it concerns him no more. Or, being unscientific, we hear with surprise the *Eureka* of the discoverer in some region of abstract science. It is a marvel to us that such a discovery can interest any one; for to us, it is purely unintelligible, and we pass on to practical life.

There are, it is true, men who live in a world

of their own, whom we are inclined to pity as victims of a misplaced enthusiasm which shuts them out from the enjoyment of a fuller life. But this cannot be said of religion and religious experiences. Every one who has a shred of religion belonging to him, who is not fast bound in the misery and iron of a cramping materialism, believes that at some time in the future, be it sooner or be it later, whether he longs for it, or shrinks from it, with or without the consent of his own will, he must come to appear before God, and stand in His presence. The day comes when link after link which bound him to earth has now been snapped, when neither the affection of his friends, nor his own ardent desire, nor the skill of the doctor avail to keep him here any longer; and he passes into the presence of God, or rather the presence of God then becomes manifest to him. It is a supreme moment. His friends speak of him as 'poor,' and 'gone,' and 'dead.' Perhaps one who poses as being more wise than the others says, 'Now at last he knows the great secret.' But this is not so, the great secret was his to know before this time. 'I know Whom I have believed.' It is this felt presence of God, daily passing more and more into perfection, that we are trying to discover. And yet no doubt it is a solemn moment which we may well shrink from, when the veils are shifting which hide us from God. Here is the first sight of the unknown world. Here is the first realisation of

hope, and here the first verification of faith. We dread lest we should once more realise that common experience, when the first sight of a place which we for long had wished to see shows to us that our unverified impressions were wrong, and that what we believed on the testimony of faith is not corroborated by the evidence of sight. This is a torture which tries many tender minds with a doubt which they dare not formulate. 'Will there after all be no veil to draw, only a blank, only thick darkness—annihilation?'

It is a terrible thing to drift into the presence of an unknown God. It will be a sorry thing indeed if, while our lips falter out the undying aspirations and confidence of the saints, our heart cowers in tacit unbelief and shrinks from its own protestations. But the more devout Jew seemed to have mastered the secret of a happy death in that he had found this presence of God for which we are seeking, here in this world, a presence from which nothing could separate him. Death when it came to him was but a change of position towards the central sun fixed immovably in the firmament of his life. It is this attitude, indeed, which more than anything else has fastened on the ancient people of God the unjust accusation that they had no conception of a future state. It did not concern them to think much about a future state to whom God was a real presence in their daily life of the present.

How then did the Jew secure this great spiritual treasure, this sense of the presence of God, which resisted even the obliterating hand of death? In many ways: first of all in his worship. Worship to him was not merely a preparation for the coming of God, but it was a present realisation of it. In truth, the writer of the Forty-second Psalm is lamenting primarily his separation from the sanctuary of God; here is the presence which he is thirsting for, when the multitude throng up into the house of God. Jerusalem was the centre of Israel's hope, and the glory of Jerusalem was the Temple, whose imagery still appeals to us in its picture of the Jerusalem which is above, and which is free, in that temple not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.

And this presence of God, thus manifested, worked itself into the very heart of his religious life. It is only with an effort, and even with some sense of repulsion, that we are able to put ourselves back into the actual details of the Levitical sacrifices. The more satisfied we are, the more materialised we become, the less are we able to understand the intense significance of the ritual of sacrifice, and the intimate connection of God's presence with that smoking, blood-stained altar. An earnest man will hope that the day will never come when sin will lose for him its significance. The academic discussions of the nature of sin, and the endeavour to mitigate its malignity, or even to

elevate it into a search after God, are all significant of a loss of moral sensitiveness, which follows closely on the development of self-esteem and pride. There is a profound sense of wrong, and of the violation of right consequent on a bad action, which in themselves constitute a pain, which, if a man ceases to feel it, would argue in him a subtle detriment equivalent to a mortification of the spiritual sense. And we can see how the attempt to deal with this sense of sin in the blood of the sacrifice endeared the altar to the worshipper, how it brought him into a supernatural presence, where without impiety and folly the attempt might be made to shift the burden of guilt. How often it has been the case that the first movings of heart in the poor heathen towards Christianity have been through the doctor who has alleviated pain; so it was a great impulsion towards God that the Jew was enabled to bring his sins to One Who could at least weigh their burden, grieve for their guilt and point out a more perfect deliverance. There he stands, the wrongdoer, with the helpless animal which he has singled out, at his own charges. Now he lays his hands on its unwitting head, mystically transferring the load which was unsupportable; now he slays the victim with his own hands, its flesh is consumed with fire, typifying the exhaustion of God's wrath against sin, and the blood is sprinkled by the priest for an atonement. God was behind all this ceremony, His presence was projected on to

it, He fulfilled it with sacramental value; and we may be sure that one strong tie at all events which bound the soul to God was the sense that He was at hand, a very present help in trouble, able to sympathise with man in his sorest need, and able to meet the longing for expiation, for anything which could ease the weight and transfer the load of that burden more intolerable than any other burden, the sense of sin.

So it was once more with their yearly religious commemorations. God never allowed them to think that He was an absentee ruler, an impersonal First Cause, or a poetical abstraction. They were what they were because God's hand had wrought deliverance. Three times in the year every Jewish man had, in the expressive phraseology of Holy Scripture, to appear before the Lord, and to remember that all his history was but a prolonged shadow of the Almighty's hand. 'Thy name also is so nigh: and that do Thy wondrous works declare.'[1]

But beyond all, it is impossible to forget that God vouchsafed to certain holy souls, as we have already seen, an indwelling, pervading presence, which spread far and wide in the power of a spiritual contagion. 'The Psalms,' says Dean Church, 'stand up like a pillar of fire and light in the history of the early world. They lift us at once into an atmosphere of religious thought which is the highest that man has ever reached; they come with all the

[1] Ps. lxxv. 2.

characteristic affection and emotions of humanity, everything that is deepest, tenderest, most pathetic, most aspiring, along with all the plain realities of man's condition and destiny, into the presence of the living God.'[1]

To have seen thus that the sense of God's presence was a realised fact before the Incarnation, must urge us on to seek for it along the same paths, and to expect even fuller light from the nearer manifestations of His glory. It ought to be more possible for us to attain to a more complete realisation of that presence which is at once the privilege, the delight and strength of the faithful Christian.

II

Let us follow the Psalmist in his aspiration for the presence of God, for it is a craving which God Himself has planted within us, and which He Himself has designed to satisfy. It is not an easy thing to feel this presence, or to linger in it, when we have found it. It is a difficult thing to breathe the rarefied air of heaven where God is, and not to fall a victim to the mountain sickness, which staggers us as we try to climb. The three privileged Apostles slept during the mystic manifestation of the Transfiguration and in the scene of awe and dread in the Garden of Gethsemane. It is only by following up the well-known paths which lead into His presence, and by following the guidance which He vouchsafes

[1] Church, *The Gifts of Civilization*, p. 372.

us that we can hope to find Him, Who is a God that hideth Himself as we

> 'reach out
> To the least glimmer of the feet of God.'

There is a mystery and an awe even about the material fabric of a church which is reminiscent of a presence which is not human. It is rare, even in churches which are most visited by tourists for their interest or their architecture, to be obliged to remind them of the reverence due to the invisible Majesty which inhabits them, as shown in the bared head, the hushed voice, and the lowly demeanour of him who enters into a Presence. Those who built our great cathedrals and our parish churches never built them as architectural specimens or national monuments or mere public buildings. As such it would not be possible to bind them round the heart of the nation or the community which uses them. To strip them of their characteristic functions would be to strip them of their glory. Here it is true of the worshipper, as was said of Daniel and his friends, that we are so nourished through our earthly years that at the end thereof we might stand before the King. But not merely to meet His presence hereafter; the whole point insisted on here is that we must try and penetrate into the fullness of the Incarnation. True it is that we shall have gained much if worship has made real to us, however faintly, the outline of that Majestic Presence before Whom we have to stand, and the characteristics of

that life of which we all hope to partake. But at the same time we are losing out of the fullness of life, we are missing its supreme excellence if we fail to realise now and here that in God's presence is the fullness of joy, even if at His right hand hereafter there is pleasure for evermore.

And if the material fabric of the church eloquent of a Presence lifts us up to God, if worship brings us nigh to Him, so with us as with the Jew of old, the commemoration of the wondrous works of God manifests the nearness of His name. We owe a great deal to the ordered round of fast and festival; it is for us a great road leading to that place where the voice of the Lord God may be heard walking in the garden in the cool of the day.[1] The daily pressure of the rapid sequence of current events makes it very easy to forget God until at last we practically try to do without Him. We easily fall into the way of thinking that the world is managed by a few great men, that it depends entirely on human effort, and is to be estimated by a purely human estimate of greatness. And then the Church takes us away to a poor village like Nazareth, in a remote part of the Roman Empire, which has itself vanished, and strives to concentrate our attention upon an unknown Virgin as the most perfect product of human generation, fitted to be the θεοτόκος, the Mother of God. We are brought face to face with sheer miracle, and to a way of God which is

[1] Genesis iii. 8.

hidden, and to an intervention of God which is characteristic and inexplicable. Or we are taken to the Cross of shame and are bidden to take our stand by S. John and see mysteries, or to the open grave and see once more the hidden ways of God. Or we climb the Mount of the Ascension, or linger in the Temple courts, where the earth throbs, and the Holy Spirit glows with fiery inrush in the hearts of the Apostles. All these are roads opened up into heaven, paths which are lost in the unseen. Still as we traverse them we may look for the presence of God. Lowly virginity, spotless purity may still look for His indwelling presence. Deep and heart-broken contrition may still set up its penitent's cross by the Saviour's side on Calvary. Still through the Resurrection of Jesus Christ and His empty tomb our graves are vitalised into living seed-plots of a resurrection body. Still the path of glory quivers with light which marks the royal road of His divine approach, when having led captivity captive He gives gifts unto men. Still the wind and the flame protest to our materialism, that if we cannot find God with a telescope, nor the soul with a dissecting knife, it is because we have used the wrong instruments. Faith which realises the unseen, and appropriates the hoped for, is the great instrument to which the Church points us, in the contemplation of events as to which she never alters, in the apprehension of forces whose importance can never be superseded. Behind peace and citizenship,

health and reform, education, and all the manifold schemes of awakening life stands God, in Whose presence is life, Who rules the world which He once made very good, and has redeemed for Himself by His own most precious Blood. 'I asked the earth, and it answered me, "I am not He"; and whatsoever are in it confessed the same. I asked the sea and the deeps, and the living, creeping things, and they answered, "We are not thy God, seek above us." I asked the moving air, and the whole air with his inhabitants answered, "Anaximenes was deceived, I am not God." I asked the heavens, sun, moon, stars. "Nor (say they) are we the God Whom thou seekest." And I replied unto all the things which encompass the door of my flesh, "Ye have told me of my God, that ye are not He; tell me something of Him." And they cried out with a loud voice, "He made us."'[1]

III

In going on to consider that which is the immediate subject of this book, the special and peculiar manifestation of God in the Holy Communion, in the Divine Presence of the Eucharist, it will be necessary to insist not only on the right of our approach to God without the constant medium of the Blessed Sacrament, but on the necessity of our being able so to realise His presence at the end of those paths of which we have spoken, which conduct

[1] S. Augustine, *Confessions*, x. 6.

us to Him. No one can see much of popular Eucharistic devotion in the Western Church, especially in those habits which tend so powerfully to overshadow the Liturgy with an unauthorised use of the Divine Presence apart from the immediate purpose for which it was ordained, without feeling the truth of these words: 'But the devotion as a whole has a general tendency, and the general tendency is hardly that of enabling one to realise the universal presence of God in the world, or the constant presence of all Christians, at all times and in all places, to the heavenly things, or the indwelling of Christ in the soul of the individual and in the living Church. The indisputable tendency of this devotion, and of the theology which reduces even the gift of communion to a temporary visit, is towards conceiving of Christ's presence in the Church as local and external—a conceiving of it which becomes more and more remote from S. Paul's, or S. John's, or S. Augustine's.'[1]

And yet it is not to be wondered that those who have experienced the mystic Eucharist of Maundy Thursday should constrain Him to enter in and abide with them in the familiar intercourse of the daily walk. Certainly if we have shared with the Jew so far the presence of God in Temple and in Temple service, we pass far beyond him, even in the privilege which he enjoyed of the presence between the Cherubim of the Mercy Seat, in that privileged

[1] Bishop Gore, *The Body of Christ*, pp. 140, 141.

approach in which Christ enters with His presence into our very hearts, in the sacramental extension of the Incarnation, in the rite of His own appointing, in which He becomes the Priest and Victim both in one, of the new Sacrifice of the new Covenant. We shall have to consider at length what He Himself promised and explained to us with reference to this presence; we shall have to puzzle ourselves as to how we are to realise the method and mode of it. Feast and sacrifice, feast upon the sacrifice, must both be considered, the dispositions necessary to a devout reception of Christ, the adoration with which we greet Him, the preparation we make for Him, and the different stages and vicissitudes of our life, which He vouchsafes to bless. Certainly any presence of God which we may be privileged to realise is surpassed in this mystery, which the wit of man cannot explain, nor his eagerness exhaust, nor his waywardness banish. Here is a Presence which goes before us on our journey, a pillar of cloud by day, a pillar of fire by night, in all times of our tribulation, in all times of our wealth, a very present help to lead us to our promised land. As we meditate on it with reverence, we cannot but pray that we may be guided aright, always to think and hold of this great mystery as shall be pleasing to God, and for the benefit of our own souls, and for the attaining of final salvation.

Thoughtful men will sometimes complain that the worship of the Incarnate Jesus, not only in the

sacramental worship alluded to above, but always, has a tendency to throw out of proportion the worship of the Father and the adoration due to the Holy Ghost. They say that it is difficult to find a hymn or an aspiration in popular devotion which is not addressed to the Lord Jesus. But surely it must be remembered that there are not three Gods with separate rivalries. He who worships in the unity of the Blessed Trinity worships God. But at the same time this which is asserted is not to be wondered at, rather it is what He Himself predicted and in a sense ordered. 'No man cometh unto the Father, but by Me.'[1] But apart from this, we may see in this reaching out after the Saviour the same instinct which brought the Jew to God, and made His presence real to them through sacrifice. Say what we will, there is this deep craving in the heart for forgiveness, for restoration, for the revival of self-respect, for a return to a place in the universe which the sinner has forfeited by his sins. This feeling may be clamoured down, evaded, hurried away from, magnificently dismissed by the weavings of intellectual subtlety; but still it clings with obstinate persistency. 'How should man be just with God?'[2] There is the appetite for forgiveness, which clamours for satisfaction in the presence and power of a Saviour. And so, as we draw near the Christian altar we find no unmeaning, unconscious victim laying down its ineffectual

[1] S. John xiv. 6. [2] Job ix. 2.

blood in expiation; but we find a present, conscious, tender, loving Saviour willing to bear our sin, willing to take our poor, inadequate repentance and cover it with His own precious merits, and endow it with the riches of His sacrifice; so that driven in along the battle-field of temptation the soul falls back upon God, to find the real presence of a Saviour and the real expiation of an atoning sacrifice. And therefore at the altar more than anywhere else the Christian soul may learn what is meant by standing before the presence of God. He may test there his powers of rejoicing in the light of His countenance and basking in the sunlight of His smile. He may learn there something of the awe which veils the faces of the Cherubs, and fills the Temple with smoke in the contemplation of a Majesty which may consume as well as quicken, and overwhelm the soul, conscious of its unworthiness and burdened with its guilt.

The practice of the presence of God is an exercise which has commended itself to holy souls, and would do something to roll away the earthborn mists which shut us out from the sun shining so brightly around us. It is not right that a Christian should only be able with difficulty, and almost a sense of unreality, to appropriate to himself the ardent aspirations of the Psalms, so full of love for a personal presence and passionate with a desire for God. It is not right that we should fail so constantly to look beyond the pains of dissolution to

the real Presence unveiled and open to us. No one should acquiesce in a disability which prevents us from appropriating the loving purpose of God to make Himself known to us here; or allow for one moment that those who lived in an age when as yet God had not tabernacled with man in the Incarnation should be nearer than we are to Him Who offers to dwell in us, and be the very life of our life. How different this life would be if men could only realise all that they might realise and be all that they might be. It may be that we have to learn more to practise ourselves in divine contemplation and in the realisation of the nearness of God. It is a mournful fact that we are sometimes more conscious of the presence and power of the supernatural agents of evil than we are of the presence of God and of holy desires. Why is it when the goodness of God overflows in beauty of cloud and sky, of flower and plant and tree, when all the busy agencies of what we call nature are wrapped up in grace of form, and delicacy of colour, and perfection of workmanship, why is it when God woos us with beauty and allures us with light, that the response of man seems too often to be ugliness? It is a sad indication of the failure of mere refinement and of culture to trace the trail of moral foulness dragging its polluted slime even over the handiwork of God. We are met by defilements of natural beauty, foul writing, evil suggestion. Sounds which are only

hideous and degrading mingle with the voices of nature, which were meant to recreate and cheer the holiday-maker as he comes away out of the weary toil of his life imprisoned in the grimy town. Why is it that without any inducement or effort a man's thoughts, if he will allow them, run to evil? Why is it, if he wishes to go to his destruction, agents seem ever ready to his hand to aid, abet, and lead him away; whereas if he wishes to turn to God, like S. Christopher in the legend, he must laboriously look for some one to show him how he may consecrate his new-found zeal, and develop his aspirations? Is it because we are here confronted with God's recognition of our own innate dignity? The devil does not hesitate to force either himself or his temptations upon us. He is ever alluring, tempting, goading into sin, in the persistency of an attack which by many a sap and entrenchment is making its way toward the seat of the will, which it hopes to dethrone; whereas God respects human free will. He will not tempt us to good unless we first invite Him. The disciples on the first Easter Day very nearly lost the blessing which turned their sorrow into joy: it was only when they constrained Him to enter in and tarry with them that the Divine Stranger Who had cheered their sad walk with His burning words consented to come to them, to make Himself known in all the ineffable joy of His presence. So it is that the power of temptation to evil is but a faint adumbration of

the power of allurement to good in those who have because they ask, who find because they seek, to whose knock there is an opening. Such is the method of the Wisdom of God, of which the wise man speaks. 'At the first she will walk with him by crooked ways, and bring fear and dread upon him, and torment him with her discipline, until she may trust his soul, and try him by her laws. Then will she return the straight way unto him, and comfort him, and show him her secrets.'[1]

If the secret of a good death is a good life, the true *memento mori* a *memento vivere*, so the practice of the presence of God will lead us on into that state where death itself is only one more day's march forward with God. 'Speak unto the children of Israel, that they go forward.' So runs the command. The Egyptians are behind; already life is broken, strength is ebbing, the irresistible march lays its hand on more and more positions as it presses us towards the flood which lies in front of us. 'Go forward' is what we have done before in many a trouble. So we laid hold of the serpent of difficulty by the tail, and it became a rod of power. So we looked at a serpent of brass, and lo! it was a sacrament of life; so we walked round Jericho, and the walls fell down; or we dipped in Jordan and the leprosy departed. With Christ we can go into the Red Sea and find it only another day in His presence. But the presence of God here, so per-

[1] Ecclesiasticus iv. 17.

vading, so real, demands a power of apprehension on our part. Worship brings home to us the indwelling presence of God, Who, dwelling not in temples made with hands, yet condescends to visit us. The beauty of God's handiwork around us is ever calling to us to find Him Who is only hiding Himself in light, Who is not far from every one of us. But more especially the Eucharistic Presence makes every heart a Nazareth where He vouchsafes to enter in and dwell with the humble soul who welcomes Him with glad assent, and bows before the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost.

CHAPTER II

THE PROMISE OF A SPECIAL PRESENCE

'Quid enim bonum Ejus, et quid pulchrum Ejus, nisi frumentum electorum, et vinum germinans virgines?'

We turn now to consider more in detail the promise of a special presence of God, more intimate than anything which had as yet been vouchsafed to man, wherein by virtue of the Incarnation Christ pledged His presence to the Church always, in His Sacred Humanity, by a subtle, spiritual power, which rendered that Which in Itself was not ubiquitous present in a Sacrament, linked with all the transcendent powers of the Godhead.

This, we assert, was first promised, in terms of great mystery, and then afterwards established in accordance with the promise, in a perpetual ordinance, which is the central act of Christian devotion.

This promise is recorded for us only in the theological Gospel of S. John. It would seem as if the old man had wished to put on record the doctrinal basis enunciated by Christ Himself, and the profound significance of that which, even as he

wrote his reminiscences, was the sacred liturgy or public act in which the Church worshipped God, the divine means of grace in which His presence was vouchsafed to the Christian soul. Here for long years the disciple whom Jesus loved had found his solace and delight, until he could see the unveiled presence of His beloved in the city of God; and he wished that all should know how intimate this union might be, how sacred its obligations, how solemn its responsibilities; and he wrote down that which is one of the most precious of all the treasures which the Holy Scriptures contain, Christ's own promise of the gift which He willed to bestow, Christ's own explanation of the nature of the gift, and of our duties respecting it.

I

It was at Capernaum, he remembered the circumstances well, and the Holy Spirit had fixed them in his memory, so that it was no impression tinged by his own individuality, but a true record of Christ's own words on a subject wherein it behoved the writer to be accurate.

There had been one of those displays of divine power which had appealed to the hearts of a great number of people, because it touched a common need in a simple way, it had to do with the ordinary appetite of hunger, which had been satisfied by a miraculous multiplication of the ordinary means of ministering to hunger, namely bread. And the

next day our Lord had been surrounded, as He taught in the synagogue in Capernaum, by an eager multitude, expectant, curious, inclined to credit Him further, but perplexed with unsolved doubts. To these our Lord at once appeals, by words of severe self-analysis, telling them that the motive of their devotion was more carnal than spiritual, and had more to do with loaves than miracles. But at once He had lifted them up to higher thoughts. 'Work not,' He said in effect, 'for perishing bread such as I give you, work rather for that which will last for ever.' How then, they said, were they to set about this work. Simply by believing in Him. But why? What sign can He give that they should so believe? Moses gave the sign of manna, and manna was bread from heaven: what sign could He give? There they were wrong. Moses did not give the bread, but God, and, moreover, it was not the true bread from heaven. But the same God was prepared to give them now the true bread, the bread which would sustain life. This, they said, was the bread which they should desire. Well, said our Lord, it is I Myself. 'I am the Bread of Life.' I have come down from the Father to feed the world. To this they had answered at once, that it was obviously not true, He had not come down from heaven, for His parentage was known.

Yes, our Blessed Lord had replied, it is true, only it requires a special and spiritual apprehension to grasp it. I repeat, 'I am the Bread of Life.'

I am Myself the living Bread, and whosoever partakes of this Bread shall live for ever.'

Then he had gone on to say, in ever-growing paradox, 'The Bread which I will give is My Flesh, for the life of the world.'

This, with increasing irritation, they had pronounced to be impossible. 'How can this Man give us His Flesh to eat?' The statement, however, had not been withdrawn; unless indeed they so ate His Flesh and drank His Blood, they had no life in them. Then had followed several profound statements. 'My Flesh is true meat.' 'My Blood is true drink.' To eat and drink this is to abide in Me: it is to 'live because of Me,' as 'I live because of the Father.' And that this was the Bread of immortality of which He first spoke. These words, the Apostle remembered, once more gave offence; and he remembered also how our Lord explained them as not to be taken in a carnal sense, but in a spiritual meaning. Such had been the promise which had afterwards been fulfilled on that night of mysteries, the first Maundy Thursday.

It is necessary, however, to notice that there are those who maintain that S. John was not giving an account of the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist at all, that he did not so understand our Lord's words, nor did he anticipate that they would ever be so understood. Or at least, if they have any such meaning, that it is only inferential and not primary.

The whole question is ably discussed by Archdeacon Robert Isaac Wilberforce in his book on the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, who concludes absolutely in favour of the Eucharistic reference of this passage, while he says, 'For while our Lord's words are interpreted of the Holy Eucharist by well-nigh every ancient writer, there is not a single ancient writer by whom this interpretation is denied.' And he points out that the various explanations which have been current since the sixteenth century, such as that of Cardinal Caietan and others, have all 'originated with persons who had a theory to support, which the natural and received meaning of this passage was thought to oppose.'[1]

Bishop Westcott also, in a valuable note, in his well-known *Commentary on S. John*, although he maintains a less rigid interpretation than that of Wilberforce, is prepared to contend that the truth which is presented in its absolute form in this discourse is presented in a specific act and in a concrete form in the Holy Communion.

The following considerations, however, may be advanced in favour of that interpretation of this passage which views it as our Lord's own authoritative pronouncement on a matter of the most vital importance to His Church, which S. John, the theological Evangelist, was providentially enabled to record.

[1] R. I. Wilberforce, *The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, 1854, p. 180 (third edition).

First, as an argument addressed to English Churchmen, the Prayer Book would seem to associate this chapter with the Holy Eucharist, by weaving its statements into the exhortation addressed to communicants in the service of Holy Communion. And secondly, as stated above, the testimony of ancient writers is overwhelmingly in its favour. Further, many of the reasons brought against the traditional interpretation by certain extremists are very unconvincing. It is asserted, for instance, that when our Lord spoke of eating His Flesh, He was referring only to a joyful participation in His doctrines; and they point us to expressions in the Scriptures, such as those in Psalms xix. 10; cxix. 103; Prov. ix. 5; Ecclesiasticus xxiv. 20, 21. But if so, why were the Jews offended with that, with which, *ex hypothesi*, they were so familiar? And if this was all that our Blessed Lord meant to convey, can we imagine One so tender and considerate allowing the Jews to go away offended, when one word of explanation would have set them right? But indeed the expression was not an ordinary one, nay, to the Jews 'drinking blood' would savour of extreme profanity. They may have been, nay, were familiar, with the idea of eating wisdom, as equivalent to assimilating the precepts of wisdom; but assuredly not with any kind of expression which would represent receiving a teacher's doctrine under the metaphor of eating his flesh.

It may also weigh with us to notice that if all Eucharistic allusion is denied to this discourse, then the Gospel of S. John contains no reference whatsoever to the Holy Eucharist. If, on the other hand, the discourse is Eucharistic, it falls in at once with a characteristic of the Fourth Gospel, which shows us the Evangelist as more busied with doctrinal mysteries than with historical incidents. Writing when he did, he takes these for granted, and feels himself able to supply that which his closer intimacy with our Blessed Lord had enabled him to receive, the doctrinal basis of the Christian traditions, the inner meaning of their common worship.[1]

Assuming, then, that we have here Christ's own promise of His special presence to the faithful, let us note the great lesson which He here insists on, namely the absolute need of the mediation of a Saviour between God and man. It is strange to see how this great truth has dropped out of popular conceptions of religion. A sacramental system is more and more being regarded as a negligible accretion to the simple doctrines which regulate the relations between God and man, invented largely in the interests of a self-seeking sacerdotalism, and upheld by the Catholic Church on much the same principles as those which dictated the cry, 'Great is Diana of the Ephesians.' And it is here that

[1] See Luckock, *The Special Characteristics of the Four Gospels*, chap. xxviii.

this discourse as recorded by S. John is of such value to us: it has proclaimed for ever the underlying truth of all sacraments, that they are part of that necessary mediation between God and man, in very truth extensions of the Incarnation to the individual soul, and as such absolutely vital to the right conception of Christian religion. The frequent failure of systems of moral teaching to secure a right moral life, the failure of the appeal to human pride and human self-respect to avert even gross sins, the miserable failure of much which passes for education to secure even its own ends, all bear witness to the great truth, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you.' This is the main and prominent lesson: which passes from the merely general truth of the need of Christ's mediation into the specific realisation of it for the Church, in the eating of His Flesh, and the drinking of His Blood.

The Jews perfectly understood the meaning of the general principle, the need of a mediation, while they rejected the Prophet of Nazareth as not fulfilling the requirements of a Mediator. But the specific application of this principle, in the eating of Christ's Flesh and the drinking of His Blood, they pronounced to be unintelligible, they were offended at it; they left Him, neither were they able to escape from their difficulty by following Christ up to the spiritual plane, on which He told them His words would become intelligible. This promulga-

tion of sacramental truth, and its hostile reception, meets with its counterpart in our own day; and in our own religious controversies the mediation of Christ is held as one of those abstract truths which are rarely realised, even by those who most fiercely defend them. When attention is drawn to the sacramental system which embodies and makes possible this truth, men fall back on the Prophet of Nazareth, and shrink from the Incarnate God. When they are bidden as a condition of life to eat His Flesh and to drink His Blood, they become wrapped and confused in carnal notions, which they realise only to reject, and hear only to repudiate; and so sacramental truth is either debased to the mere devout commemorations of an event in Gospel history, with Zwingli; or is involved in some difficult theory of receptionism, which, as we shall see later, has all the difficulties and none of the consistency of the traditional faith.

II

What then is the nature of the divine gift in Holy Communion, based on this revelation preserved to us by S. John? 'It is on all sides plainly confessed,' says Hooker, in the passage quoted at length above, 'that this Sacrament is a true and a real participation of Christ, Who thereby imparteth Himself, even His whole entire Person, *as a mystical Head* unto every soul that receiveth Him.'[1]

[1] Hooker, *Eccles. Pol.*, v. lxvii. 7.

And we must remember that the gift is the gift of Christ's Manhood, not as dead on the Cross, but as living, ascended, and glorified, *i.e.* 'the spiritual principle of His Manhood as opposed to its material elements.' This we assimilate by faith, namely, 'the vitality of His Manhood inseparable from His whole Person,'[1] so that in and by this Holy Sacrament we might realise the great conception of S. Paul, 'I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me,'[2] a life which is transubstantiated with Christ, where Christ becomes the 'I' Who regulates, and governs, and acts through the whole complicated organism which I call 'self.'[3] Even while we read, we feel how possible it is to veil our ignorance under unintelligible words; and to think that we are explaining the words of Christ and the dogmas of the Church when we are only explaining our own explanations. It is possible again for teachers who violently repudiate anything which may seem even to savour of verbal inspiration of the Bible to torture individual words and phrases, until they lose their proportion in the context; but there is an idea which stands out prominently from this discourse at Capernaum, and which ministered at first to its rejection, and that is the idea of feeding and food. Our sacramental participation of Christ is of the nature of food.

[1] Bishop Gore. [2] Gal. ii. 20.
[3] The author, *The Man of God*, p. 43, etc.

The last word surely has not been said about food, the ordinary food of life, in its bearing on those parts of our organism which are not physical or material. There is something very suggestive in the thought that the first Adam brought death into his soul through food and the second Adam confers life upon the soul through food also. Anyhow, this is a prominent feature in our Lord's promise, as it is the common experience of those who take Him at His word, eating Him men live by Him. It is idle to attempt to relate this to other religions, or, to explain it by reference to ordinary experience. We can only hope to understand it by removing it into the field of spiritual experience, where in the end only those who have eyes to see and ears to hear will be able dimly and imperfectly to realise the terms in which this truth is conveyed to us.

Jesus Christ had before Him, we may reverently believe, the problem how to make life more complete and fuller. 'I am come,' He says, 'that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.'[1] Man ordained to be a kind of first-fruits of God's creatures, whatever he may have been once, was certainly now not all that he might be. If life is 'the continuous adjustment of internal relations to external relations,' that is, if to be alive is to be in vital connection with our surroundings, then man as he appears to Christ is only half

[1] S. John x. 10.

alive. With his body he may be in relation with the sensual surroundings of his life, with his mind he may be in touch with much that makes appeal to his reason, his imagination, and his intellectual powers generally, but the spirit for the most part seems to have fallen out of touch with the spiritual environment which is about him. It had been Christ's mission to make vital the connection, to manifest the Father, to make men feel that the absorbing questions of food and clothing would be better met through the spirit: 'Your Heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things.'[1] The preservation of life, the first instinct of humanity, is to be provided for in the same way. It is not the will of your Father which is in Heaven that any one of these little ones should perish.'[2] That which we truly name Providence, as a convenient pigeon-hole in which to place all those causes which we cannot label or explain, became in Christ's hands the revelation of a personal God.

The Apostle of Jesus Christ was a richer man than the fisherman of the Lake of Galilee.

The devout Christian who believes in the promise of Jesus Christ is a richer man also than the ordinary man of the world. 'In Christ,' he touches a wider environment, his citizenship is in heaven. He is 'come unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the Heavenly Jerusalem, and to an

[1] S. Matt. vi. 32. [2] S. Matt. xviii. 14.

innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant.' . . .[1]

And in a world like this, it would never be easy, it could never be easy, to keep up this spiritual relation to spiritual surroundings on which true life depended. Christ alone, in the heart, can disentangle the spirit from the constant tendency to be dragged down by the material surroundings of life, and hence the connection with Christ was to be more intimate with those who came after them than it was with the apostles, by reason of the sacramental life, which became possible by reason of the Crucifixion, and all that flowed from it. 'If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature.'[2] Together with the setting up of the kingdom of the Church, there was to be the setting up of the individual. The Christian was to be a new type of individual, such as the world had never yet seen. It was to be as if a man were to appear who knew how to evoke out of some complicated musical instrument those combinations of sounds and harmonies which had never been produced before. Hitherto it had served to produce sound, now it produces harmony; hitherto it had been a practical machine, now it is a work of art. And this life, like other and lower types, is subject to the laws of

[1] Heb. xii. 22-23. [2] 2 Cor. v. 17.

life. A human being is not born in full correspondence with all his surroundings, he has to grow; so the Christian has to grow into the fullness of life, by aid of nourishment ministered by copious supplies and draughts of Christ's own life.

Hence it would seem that it was not merely as a picturesque symbol, but as a living truth, that our Lord spoke of a heavenly under the form of an earthly nourishment. Growth in grace is the idea which comes before us most prominently when we talk of 'feeding on Christ.'

Obvious as it is, this is an aspect of Holy Communion which is always being lost sight of. At the time of the Reformation it was found that an exaggerated awe of the divine gift had checked the frequency of Communion; two centuries of later inadequate teaching produced the same result from an imperfect conception of it. Most certainly with this food as with every other, there must be a precedent appetite, or capacity for it. And so when the spiritual life is becoming death-stricken there is no desire, no aptitude, for divine communion, and the Holy Sacrament is neglected. And yet it is not too much to say, that there is no possibility of spiritual growth without it. See what life might be, which gradually grows in Christ by feeding on Him. Then, the body, which is such a source of alarm, becomes the friend of the soul. The mind, by assimilating what is good, and rejecting what is bad, becomes richer and fuller,

while the spirit is like that land on which the eyes of the Lord ever rest from the beginning of the year even unto the end of the year. Looking outwards, each day comes with its own experiences and its own store. Youth, manhood, old age, each contribute; the years of plenty supply the years of famine; going through the vale of misery the soul uses it for a well, and the pools are filled with water. Life is a march onward with God, and the soul grows by experience and is nourished, as by a sacrament, by outward things, which veil God. God is in the midst of her, Christ tabernacles in the soul, and therefore it lives in a daily wider and fuller correspondence.

But an even growth like this is very rare; it is easier to imagine it than to find it in actual experience.

Yet Christ designed His sacramental Presence not only positively to help us by developing the powers of life within, but also negatively in destroying those powers of death, which tend to sever the connection between our soul and that which ministers to the fullness of life. It is a presence of strength as well as a presence of growth.

It is not only that we live in an unhealthy world. This, indeed, we become conscious of very soon, as we lament our faint virtues and our disposition to imbibe the infection of sin which we find all around us. There are some who speak of sacramental Absolution, for instance, as a medicine and not as

food, forgetting that we are like those who live in malarious and fever-stricken districts, who cannot do without constant medicine. It is hard enough to thrive in these unhealthy conditions in which life must be followed. Life in a fallen world needs a great reserve of strength to enable us to throw off the poisonous germs which settle on us, and this is just what we do not possess. There is an affinity between us and that which is attractive even while it does us harm. And the resistance which human nature left to itself can offer is very poor, if once it is confronted with the peculiar evil which tends to threaten it. It is here especially that we feel the strength which Christ offers to us in throwing Himself into our weak nature. Here our sinful bodies are made clean by His Body, and our souls washed through His most precious Blood. The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for us preserves our body and soul unto everlasting life; and His Blood shed bestows immortality. He in this sense is the life of our life. The food and the medicine, the strength which is made perfect in weakness. The grace which is above nature giving power to the defects of natural weakness.

But sacramental strength means even more than this. A material age is most likely to forget not only the value of supernatural virtues, but the supernatural impetus which lies behind the allurements of vice. It is a sad confession of failure which awaits the *propaganda* of the religion of

culture, and the gospel of artistic beauty. Men see the better course and approve of it, but they follow the worse. The repulsiveness of sin is forgotten in the heat of its attractiveness, more especially if a cloak of beauty is cast over its foulness. In vain do they repeat the copy-book headings of undenominational ethics: knowing that honesty is the best policy, they become dishonest all the same, and take the risk, using, it may be, their acquired cleverness to avert more skilfully the consequences of their misdeeds. Knowing that if they waste they will want, they waste all the same and face the inevitable want. Knowing that they are sinning against themselves, they are powerless to abstain from the evil courses which mean ruin. God would have us learn, He has revealed it to us by His Apostle, that 'we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.'[1] Man left to himself has no chance against the spiritual forces banded against him. Spiritual attacks can only be met effectually by spiritual weapons. As well might we attempt to meet the modern weapons of scientific precision with bows and arrows, as spiritual temptations with the ordinary dictates of human prudence. And hence it is that once more Christ offers Himself as a source of strength against the onslaught of the spiritual foes, which, without Him, must over-

[1] Ephesians vi. 12.

whelm us. 'Thou hast been a strength to the poor, a strength to the needy in his distress, a refuge from the storm, a shadow from the heat, when the blast of the terrible ones is as a storm against the wall.'[1] Here once more, it is true, the King of Israel disguises Himself and goes into the battle. It is in and by this sacramental strength we shall find our chiefest strength against the enemy.

It is necessary also to insist on our need of strength, in view of the discipline which God must needs put upon those who are heirs of salvation. Holy Scripture does not hesitate to speak of God as in a mysterious way tempting man, for example, in the case of Abraham in Genesis xxii. Nothing is more common than to find that men, in this sense, are not able 'to bear' God: 'I am even consumed by the means of Thy heavy hand.'[2] It is a common experience that the chastisement sent to correct some crooked temper or to prepare the way for some access of blessing only drives the sufferer into irreligion, unbelief, sin, or even self-murder. We see the Divine Sufferer Himself weighed down by the exceeding burden of the atonement which was laid upon Him.

So that in view of this experience also, we can see the place which the Sacrament of divine strength holds in the economy of grace. Nor is Holy Communion, although the chiefest, the only Sacra-

[1] Isaiah xxv. 4. [2] Psalm xxxix. 11.

ment of strength. We see this idea of strength running as a hidden motive through the whole church system as ordained by Christ. Man's weakness, the devil's violence, God's discipline, need a whole system of strength on man's part, that he may deal with them aright. And hence to attempt to remove the sacramental system from the ordinary requirements of Christian life, or to preach the Fatherhood of God without the compensating doctrines of the Saviour and Sanctifier, is to court disaster.

It remains only to be seen that under the conception of food, we must include also the sense of satisfaction, the highest manifestation of which is joy in the satisfaction of the highest part of our being, the spirit. The Eucharistic food is the bare necessity of the growing life. It is the essential strength in view of the demands to be made upon that life. But God has allowed us to gather round our daily bread, refinements and delicacies beyond that which is necessary to the mere discharge of the function of nutrition. And also there is a frequent allusion in the New Testament to the marriage feast, as furnishing the imagery of heavenly joy: so that we may associate with the bread of God that conception of joy which belongs to the spiritual banquet and the Heavenly Feast.

The devout Communicant finds in this satisfaction of spirit the highest conception of spiritual joy which God vouchsafes to him.

What is joy? Have we a definite conception of what we mean by it? It stands out as a predominant note in the Gospel message: 'These things have I spoken unto you, that My joy might remain in you, and that your joy might be full.'[1] Joy is more than a mere lull in the monotony of life's pain, it is an abiding condition, a feast which is not mere eating and drinking, but one of the fruits of the Spirit, appearing in the apostolic list between two such well known qualities of life and character as love and peace. We mean by joy surely a bright, exuberant illumination which plays around the life that is satisfied, which has found what it wanted, and has realised its desire. And there is no spiritual joy to compare with that which is vouchsafed, now rarely, now frequently, now continuously to the devout partaker of Christ in the Holy Sacrament. 'What these elements are in themselves it skilleth not, it is enough that to me which take them they are the body and blood of Christ, His promise in witness hereof sufficeth, His word He knoweth which way to accomplish; why should any agitation possess the mind of a faithful Communicant but this, "O my God, Thou art true; O my soul, thou art happy"?'[2] Some theologians have, however, associated this gift of joy in the Holy Eucharist more especially with one species of the Sacrament. Although the doctrine of concomitance may be true, and we

[1] S. John xv. 11. [2] Hooker, *Eccles. Pol.*, v. lxvii. 13.

may not doubt that Christ whole and entire is present under either element, still the chalice has been held to have a special grace of its own, namely, the grace which ministers to joy: 'If the sacraments cause that which they signify, the species of bread and wine must signify in different ways; and that diversity will refer both to the sign and the mode of signifying, and to the thing signified. Therefore the effect of the two will not be common but diverse. Both species together signify the plenitude of the heavenly feast and the perfect satisfaction of the soul, which each by itself does not signify.'[1]

The same writer goes on to point out that besides the general benefit of the Sacrament, there are certain secondary effects which must be noted, as of 'bread to strengthen man's heart,' and of wine to make glad the heart of man in a spiritual transport of joy. Indeed it is one of the most astounding facts in Church history, that a large part of the Western Church should for so long have acquiesced in the withdrawal of the chalice from the laity. And it might well check those who are lightly tempted to leave the Church of England on account of supposed defects and omissions, to remember this, that in the Church of their Baptism they are at least privileged to receive the Holy Sacrament as Christ Himself ordained that it

[2] Forbes, *An Explanation of the XXXIX. Articles*; Article XXX. *ad finem.*

should be received, and are not robbed of that portion to which, rightly or wrongly, some have attributed a special attribute of spiritual joy.

There are many more and deeper considerations still which might be vouchsafed to an earnest and spiritual study of that which must ever remain as the most sacred utterance which we possess on the Eucharistic mystery; but if we learn to grow thereby, and drink in strength and attain to joy, we shall not have listened in vain to words which, to us too, are spirit and life.

CHAPTER III

THE MANNER OF THE PRESENCE

'Forsitan vestigia Dei comprehendes, et usque ad perfectum Omnipotentem reperies?'

'How can these things be?' This is the natural question which rises almost unbidden to our lips as we dwell on the profound nature of the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist as revealed in the promise made in the discourse at Capernaum, or in the mysterious record of the institution of this great Sacrament as inscribed by the pen of New Testament writers. And we feel that God does not wish to treat us as petulant children whose eager and unsuitable inquiries are checked by the simple injunction not to ask questions. The manner of the Presence is a point on which men have thought and do think strongly, and in order to defend what they believed to be the true solution of this theological problem have been willing to lay down their lives at the stake. It is a sad comment on the absorbing nature of this speculation to see the power which it has still to evoke hatred and strife in those who seem sometimes more concerned to maintain a position

and crush an opponent than they are reverently to contemplate that which comes to us as a mystery, and must ever remain a mystery to be accepted by faith, rather than accurately defined in words of man's wisdom.

And yet it would be a shallow criticism to say that the question is wrong in itself, if asked in due submission; or that the investigation of that which can never be fully revealed is a barren one. To know the truth as far as we may, carries with it a corresponding fullness of blessing, and it can never be a matter of indifference whether or not we rightly hold that which the Church has been guided to receive through long years of persistent testimony.

It may be said that an answer to the Eucharistic problem has been sought in three main directions: one which accepts our Lord's words as meaning what they say, and two others which in varying degrees shrink back from the logical consequence of the full belief and take refuge in explanations which make less of a demand on faith.

The first answer is the answer of the Catholic Church, which asserts that our Lord's words must be taken to mean that His Body and Blood are really, objectively,[1] and indeed present in the Holy Sacrament.

[1] It is a sufficient description of the terms 'subjective' and 'objective,' in connection with this controversy, to say that 'subjective' = that which resides in the subject, *i.e.* me myself. 'Objective' = that which resides in the object, anything outside myself.

When our Lord in fulfilment of His promise made at Capernaum instituted the holy mysteries of His Body and Blood, what did He mean to convey both by the action and by the terms which He used when performing the action? This is a question which may be reverently asked and examined in the light of Catholic tradition.

There are four records of what took place on that evening of mysteries, the Maundy Thursday of the Passion. They are given to us by S. Matthew, S. Mark, S. Luke, and S. Paul. They are as follows: First of all S. Matthew says, 'And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it; and He gave to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is My body. And He took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is My blood of the covenant, which is shed for many unto remission of sins . . .'[1] Then S. Mark says, 'And as they were eating, He took bread, and when He had blessed, He brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take ye: this is My body. And He took a cup, and when He had given thanks, He gave to them: and they all drank of it. And He said unto them, This is My blood of the covenant, which is shed for many.'[2] S. Luke's account is as follows: 'And He took bread, and when He had given thanks, He brake it, and gave to them, saying, This is My body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of Me. And the cup in like manner

[1] S. Matt. xxvi. 26-28, R.V. [2] S. Mark xiv. 22, 23. R.V.

after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in My blood, *even* that which is poured out for you.'[1] And S. Paul in similar terms records, 'I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, how that the Lord Jesus in the night in which He was betrayed took bread; and when He had given thanks, He brake it, and said, This is My body, which is for you: this do in remembrance of Me. In like manner also the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in My blood: this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till He come. . . .'[2]

These are the words in which the substance of our Lord's terms of institution have been recorded for us, and it is relying on the interpretation of these words that the Church has answered the loving appeal of her children as to what they should believe and hold as to this exceeding great mystery.[3]

A second answer lies at the opposite pole to this. It is the answer of Zwingli, and Protestants generally, that the Holy Communion conveys no gift in itself, enshrines no Presence, but is simply a bare memorial of our Blessed Lord's Passion and death as being in themselves historical actions whose

[1] S. Luke xxii. 19, 20, R.V. For the defence of the retention of the full reading here, see Pullan, *The Atonement*, pp. 108, 109.

[2] 1 Cor. xi. 23-26, R.V.

[3] See on the words of Institution Bishop Hedley, *The Holy Eucharist*, chap. i.

memory piety should keep alive, and thereby impart to the soul certain spiritual blessings together with the reception of the sacramental bread.

There is yet a third and popular answer which occupies a position midway between the two, and takes the form of what is known as the receptionist theory, first taught notably by Calvin, who, while taking no account of the Eucharistic consecration of the elements, yet wished to assign a full effect to the Sacrament. He maintained that the Holy Communion was only a pledge or sign.[1] The communicant received a piece of bread and a little wine as a kind of pledge or token of some greater spiritual transaction which was taking place in his soul, of a real Presence which God was vouchsafing to the heart of the pious receiver at the same moment as he was receiving the elements of bread and wine in the Sacrament. Here the only connection apparent between the bread and the wine on the one hand, and the grace received on the other, being that their reception took place at the same moment; the devout Communicant, while he received the bread and wine of the Sacrament into his mouth, would at the same time be receiving the presence of Christ in his own soul in a heavenly and spiritual manner; while Calvin would hasten to add that

[1] As to the Catechism phrase 'sign' or 'thing signified,' it is well to remember the words of Article XXV.: 'Sacraments are . . . effectual means of grace (*efficacia signa*), *i.e.* signs that carry their effect along with them. See *An Explanation of XXXIX. Articles*, by Forbes, *in loc.*

this too was dependent on the hidden fact whether or no the recipient was among those predestined to eternal salvation. On any showing the elements of bread and wine would be merely bare pledges, an assurance of God's inward operation in the soul, while with the particular addition imposed as we have seen by Calvin's tenets, the elements were a sign of an inward gift only to those predestined to eternal life, while to others they remained simply bread and wine with no spiritual value attached to them at all. Well might Mr. Keble say, 'Virtual presence is real absence.'[1]

The effect of a doctrine such as this is to attribute to the faith and election of the person who receives the Sacrament the power of making possible a simultaneous reception of bread and wine and of the Body and Blood of Christ.

According to the higher development of this doctrine to-day in popular theology, the effect of contact with the believer's faith at the moment of reception is to convert that which until then was nothing but the merest earthly elements of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, an act of equal pretension surely with that of consecration by an authorised and ordained priesthood; the

[1] It will be noticed that the term 'virtual' is used in two senses. It may mean that our Blessed Lord's Body and Blood, although present in heaven, had yet a virtue or force on earth. Or it may mean that our Lord is 'virtually' present as opposed to 'actually' because the approach of the soul to Christ produces the same result as if He were really present.

difference being that in the case described the power is ascribed to the personal faith of men, not to the word of Christ or the operation of the Holy Ghost in a sacramental mystery.[1]

To return then to the Catholic belief of the Real Presence of Christ 'under the form of bread and wine,'[2] that 'ghostly substance and not carnal' of the Sacrament.[3] It will be necessary to clear this doctrine of three misapprehensions, as they would seem to be. The first needs only to be pointed out for its grossness and error to be apparent, and cannot be said to have been maintained by any one of authority in the Church. It is the error of the men of Capernaum,[4] which speaks of our Blessed Lord's Body and Blood as present in the Sacrament under the same conditions as when He was on earth. It is this doctrine which is really denounced in Article XXVIII. as Transubstantiation, as overthrowing the nature of a Sacrament, inas-

[1] This aspect of the Eucharistic mystery is expressed with wonderful clearness by Dr. Mozley, *Lectures and Other Historical Papers* (1883), Lecture xiv., who would describe the Sacrament thus, not as common bread and wine, but as 'consecrated material elements to which the mysterious property has been imparted, that the Faithful receive and eat in them the body and blood of Christ' (p. 208).

[2] Introduction to the *Second Book of the Homilies.*

[3] Homily Concerning the Sacrament, first part. The reading 'substance' in the text, and not 'sustenance,' appears undoubtedly to be the true one.

[4] 'There is one ancient writer alone whose words at all sanction the error of the Capernites . . . Anastasius Sinaita.'—R. I. Wilberforce, *The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist* (chap. v.).

much as the elements themselves, so far from being the Sacrament of the Body and Blood, become transformed into them. Which is contrary to plain reason, contradicts the testimony of our senses, and is repugnant to us as Christians; while it overthrows the nature of a Sacrament, for henceforth the two parts which constitute a Sacrament are merged into one, the outward sign is gone, and the thing signified has taken its place. This it must be feared, however, is in some parts still the practical belief of the uneducated, as it was undoubtedly in times past, encouraged moreover by popular devotions and legends.

It will be necessary now to consider the famous doctrine of Transubstantiation, which is affixed like a label marked 'dangerous' over whole areas of Eucharistic theology, to warn away the incautious from speculations which will plunge him in this unknown yet certainly deadly abyss.

What then is Transubstantiation?[1] Transubstantiation historically was the consolidation into a dogma of ideas and modes of speech which had been common in the Western Church since the con-

[1] The Greek Church accepts the *term* Transubstantiation, but not the Roman explanation of the term, since the Council of Bethlehem, 1672, saying that the word Transubstantiation is not to be taken to define the manner in which the Bread and Wine are changed into the Body and Blood of the Lord, for this none can understand but God, but only this much is signified that the bread truly, really, and substantially becomes the very true Body of the Lord, and the wine the very Blood of the Lord.

demnation of Berengarius in the eleventh century for unsound teaching as to the presence of our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament. This dogma was pronounced at the Fourth Lateran Council in the year 1215, and was reaffirmed at the Council of Trent in 1551. It will be only fair to give the following explanation of this doctrine, from the pen of a Roman Catholic bishop, in the second volume of the Westminster Library, lately published: 'Transubstantiation, then, to the Council of Trent, and to Catholic dogma, means the conversion of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, in such a complete manner that none of the substance of the bread or wine remains but only the species thereof. It implies that our Lord's Body does not come by being moved thither locally, or by being created afresh, but by the bread being changed into it. It implies that in the Eucharistic consecration the substance of bread (or of wine) ceases or comes to an end; next that our Lord's sacred Body comes and is really and truly there; thirdly, that the bread is "converted into" His Body; fourthly, that the accidents or qualities of the bread or wine (called by the Council the *species* or appearances) continue and exist apart from, and without, the substance of the bread or wine; and fifthly, that the "conversion" there laid down is fittingly called by the name of Transubstantiation.'[1]

[1] Bishop Hedley, *The Holy Eucharist*, pp. 39, 40 (Longmans).

In trying to estimate the exact meaning and position of this dogma, it will be necessary to remember that it is an attempt to explain the mode of our Blessed Lord's Eucharistic Presence, by attributing it to a change of the substance of bread and wine into the substance of the Body and Blood of the Lord.[1] And in saying this it must be further remembered that, in the intention of those who promulgated this dogma, 'substance' had a very different meaning to that which has been referred to above, and apparently to its meaning in Article XXVIII. According to a commonly accepted theory of substance, elaborated more completely in the Scholastic theory of substance and accident,[2] all objects were divisible into their accidental parts, which were objects to the senses, and their substantial part, which was an object only to the mind. To take a very simple instance by way of an illustration: the yellow colour of an orange is an accident; it does not affect its taste or condition. It might be maintained that the shape was also an accident, that a flat or oval orange could equally be an orange, and that its particular flavour was also an accident which might conceivably be different without altering its nature. There might be an orange which was blue, oval,

[1] So Mozley, *Lectures and other Theological Papers*, p. 206.

[2] Bishop Hedley denies that the doctrine of Transubstantiation was invented by the Schoolmen (see *The Holy Eucharist*, pp. 38, 39), but avers that 'the Church' to a certain extent did adopt the word 'accidents.'

and flavoured like a peach, which to all intents and purposes was yet an orange, its accidents only being modified. It would be maintained on the other hand that the real constituent which makes an orange to be an orange, and which differentiates it from everything else is its substance; something which cannot be apprehended by the senses, which can be neither seen, felt, tasted, nor smelt, which is the real, inward part which makes a thing to be what it is.

Take away all that is cognisable by the senses, colour, taste, fibre, shape, still this inner substance remains, making the thing to be what it is, an invisible super-sensible core, as it were, into which the accidents inhere. So with a piece of bread, there would be in it an inner substance, a 'breaditity' so to speak, which is separable from its accidents, itself impalpable to the senses but real to the understanding.

It is the substance of the bread and wine in this sense which, according to the doctrine of Transubstantiation, is converted into the Body and Blood of the Lord, the accidents in the meanwhile remaining without a subject, although as far as the senses go quite unaltered.[1]

This is a strange, and as it would seem a fantastic theory, but not, as thus explained by thoughtful

[1] The whole history of Transubstantiation is discussed in Stone, *The Holy Communion*, p. 77 and following; also in *Dissertations*, by Bishop Gore, p. 230.

Roman Catholics, a gross or carnal one. The ordinary thinker would be disposed to assert that when that which appeals to the senses of touch, taste, or smell, or whatever accidents there may be, have been removed, the thing itself has been removed also, that in fact a thing is the sum of its accidents and properties, and that there is no such thing as substance in this sense. So Bishop Gore writes, 'Plainly modern philosophy of all schools recognises no distinction between substance and accident; knows no substance other than that "something objectively real," which is constituted by the qualities or relations under which alone any object is known in experience. Thus the modern Roman theologians allow to the consecrated bread and wine all the reality which any one believes any bread and wine to possess, or, in other words, explain away Transubstantiation, till it remains as little more than a verbal incumbrance due to an inopportune intrusion into Church matters of a temporary phase of metaphysics.'[1] It surely has not been for the best interests of the Church that a doctrine so weighted with philosophical difficulties has been advanced as an explanation of the inexplicable.

And in addition to this, the word 'substance' has practically two meanings, one to the philosopher, and one to the unlearned. And hence it is that a large number of people allow themselves to believe

[1] Bishop Gore, *The Body of Christ*, p. 120. First edition.

that Transubstantiation signifies that the bread and wine cease to exist after consecration, by becoming actual flesh and blood in a natural state, so that this dogma is presented in such a form as to fall under the ban of our Thirty-nine Articles, and is in fact condemned by our senses.

There remains a third attempt to explain the method and exact nature of our Blessed Lord's presence, known as Consubstantiation. This is sometimes attributed to Luther. But although he maintained the doctrine of the Real Presence of our Blessed Lord in the Holy Eucharist, the name Consubstantiation was given to the explanation which he offered by those who wished to convict him of heresy, or, to say the least, of theological confusion, asserting that a presence such as he advocated amounted to a confusion of our Blessed Lord's substance with the substance of Bread and Wine, forming as it were a third substance; as wine and water mingled together become a third substance composed of the two. It would become, as they hint, a taking of the bread into God [1] by some sort of analogy with the Incarna-

[1] It is to be noted, that although Luther allowed the elements to be the Body and Blood of Christ, yet he denied any particular efficacy to follow sacramentally on their participation. He looked upon our Blessed Lord's Presence as being like a picture or crucifix, which, although wholly inoperative in themselves, yet may be productive of an effect upon the beholder. He would seem to have supposed that the elements lose their character on their reception, and that the Presence ceased with the service. See Freeman, *Principles of Divine Service*, vol. ii. Introduc-

tion. 'The whole world sings in unison, "As the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ." No one dareth to say, so God and man and bread and wine is one Christ. Whence then have they this new companation?'[1]

It is as idle to try and examine Consubstantiation, which Luther never held nor taught, as it would be to examine some of the ignorant positions attributed to Churchmen in modern Protestant controversy.

The difficulties which have arisen from this mode of statement, as well as from the more famous doctrine of Transubstantiation, all take their rise in the same effort to define the method of the Presence, without resting content in the simple assertion of the fact. So the late Bishop Moberly—'The Roman Catholic theory of Transubstantiation, grounded as it is upon the realist theory of substance and accidents, may be taken as an instance of the introduction of very questionable, if not erroneous, philosophy into the very heart of Christian doctrine; so that if by the readjustment of the language of the Tridentine decrees the Real Presence of the Lord's Body and Blood in the Eucharist might be expressed without them, one considerable bar would be removed from the restoration of the unity of the Church.'[2]

tion, pp. 67, 68; Wilberforce, chap. v. pp. 114, 115. Third edition.

[1] See Dr. Pusey, *Real Presence*, Note A.

[2] Moberly, *The Law of the Love of God*, p. 129.

So the same bishop defending the Church of England from the most unjust charge of teaching such a fantastic doctrine as Consubstantiation, says, 'If then we are asked, as the question is not unfrequently asked among us, How then do we distinguish the doctrine of such real and objective Presence from the Lutheran tenet of Consubstantiation? it seems to be a just and sufficient answer to say that Consubstantiation, like Transubstantiation, is a *theory* of the *manner* of the Presence, whereas the Church only knows the Presence as a fact, respecting the manner and mode and extent of which she is not informed.'[1]

So also Dr. Thirlwall, Bishop of S. David's, in his charge delivered in 1866, says, 'The Church of England, on the contrary, has dealt with this subject in a spirit of true reverence as well as of prudence and charity. She asserts the mystery inherent in the institution of the Sacrament, but abstains from all attempts to investigate it, or define it, and leaves the widest range open to the devotional feelings and private meditations of her children with regard to it. And this liberty is so large, and has been so freely used, that apart from the express admission of Transubstantiation, or of the grossly carnal notions to which it gave rise, and which in the minds of the common people are probably inseparable from it, I think there can hardly be any description of the Real

[1] Moberly, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 172. First edition.

Presence, which in some sense or other is universally allowed, that would not be found to be authorised by the language of eminent divines of our Church.'

It remains, then, to examine the doctrine of the Real Presence as set forth in the authoritative documents of the Church of England. For it is not a question of the opinion or view of any individual, however learned, neither is the Church of England compromised by the expression of any such opinion however unorthodox. The appeal as to orthodoxy lies to her accredited documents as the only voice which speaks with authority. Where then shall we look for the expression of the mind of the Church of England as regards the Eucharistic doctrine of the Catholic Church? And in saying this we must remember that there are no distinctive doctrines of the Church of England, as such. There is one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism: that which is distinctive is the explanation of, or attitude towards this or that doctrine of the common Faith which she propounds for the loyal acceptance of her children.[1] What attitude then does the Church of England assume as regards the great Eucharistic teaching of the Church, which is part of the tradition of the Faith? Has she any explanation to offer, any cautions to pro-

[1] See Newbolt and Stone, *The Church of England, etc.*, pp. 34, 35.

nounce, any warnings to utter as regards a right and due estimate of this Holy Mystery, of which the Church is the guardian and the upholder? If so, where shall we find them expressed? The answer would be, In the Church Catechism, in the prayers, exhortations, and rubrics of the service for Holy Communion, in the Articles, to a certain extent in the Homilies, and in the writings of accredited divines.

First of all in the Catechism.[1] The careful and minute statement as to the Real Presence there expressed has been pointed out in the Introduction (pp. 7, 8). There we have clearly affirmed that the inward part of the Sacrament, as distinct from its outward veil, or spiritual benefit to be conferred, is the Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper. This statement of Bishop Overall, the author of this part of the Catechism, remains as the definite expression of the attitude of the Church of England towards the Eucharistic doctrine of the Church.

Let us examine next the prayers, exhortations and rubrics of the Prayer Book itself. And first of all the prayers. Perhaps of these the most significant is the Prayer of Humble Access, first issued in the 'Order of the Communion' in 1548, and therefore to be taken as indicating the mind of the Reformers. This contains the follow-

[1] See the author, *The Church Catechism*, p. 311.

ing words: 'Grant us therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the Flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His Blood [in these Holy Mysteries, that we may continually dwell in Him, and He in us] that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body, and our souls washed through His most precious Blood.'

There is then the Prayer of Consecration itself: 'Grant that we receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine, according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's Holy Institution, in remembrance of His Death and Passion, may be partakers of His Most Blessed Body and Blood.' Then follow the words and actions of the institution in all their significance: 'This is My Body'; 'This is My Blood,' together with the words of administration, which their chequered history shows to be important, 'The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee,' etc.; 'The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee,' etc.[1]

Then in the second prayer of thanksgiving after Communion we read, 'We most heartily thank Thee, for that Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ.'

Turning now to the exhortations which form

[1] For the history of these words, see Luckock, *The Divine Liturgy*, p. 332.

such a feature in our Liturgy, we may note the following points as bearing on Eucharistic doctrine. First in order comes the warning for the celebration of the Holy Communion, which the minister has to deliver on the Sunday or some holy day preceding. This exhortation, which occupied a second place in 1549, 1552, and 1559, was altered at the last revision in several ways, and notably in this: whereas the opening phrases of what is now the second paragraph used to run as follows: 'As muche as our dutye is to render to Almighty God our Heavenly Father most harty thancks for that He hath geuen His Sonne our Saviour Jesus Christ not onely to die for vs, but also to be oure Spirituall fode and sustenance as *it is declared vnto vs*, *aswel by Godes worde*, *as by the* holy sacramētes of His blessed Body and Bloude,'—now we read, 'But also to be our spiritual food and sustenance in that Holy Sacrament.' The reception of Christ's Body by the wicked seems also to be directly implied in this exhortation; certainly the Holy Sacrament is represented to be more than bread and wine when we read, 'which being so divine and comfortable a thing to them who receive it worthily, and so dangerous to them that will presume to receive it unworthily.'

In the third exhortation or invitation once more we may note the following points as bearing on this discussion. There is the term 'Holy Sacrament,' or once again, 'Holy Mysteries.' S. Paul's

strong language out of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians is quoted, as showing us that a worthy communicant spiritually eats the Flesh of Christ and drinks His Blood, while the unworthy communicant incurs the extreme danger pronounced by that Apostle; especially noteworthy being the quotation, 'not considering the Lord's Body,' of which a divine has said, 'Unless a man discern the Lord's Body where it is *not*, of necessity it must be there where it is discerned to be.' The phrase again in this exhortation, 'We dwell in Christ, and Christ with us,' is clearly reminiscent of S. John vi. 56, and sanctions by implication the Eucharistic interpretation of that chapter. And the language used, 'Eat the Flesh of Christ, and drink His Blood,' is taken, no doubt, from the same context. So that it may be said that the Eucharistic teaching of the Catechism given to the young finds no uncertain echo in the instruction given to the communicant.

Even more significant is the witness of the rubrics. The Ornaments Rubric, for the greater honour of the Sacrament, retains the Eucharist vestments hallowed by a long antiquity: and the general testimony of the rubrics has become more significant from the changes made in them by the Caroline divines, as indicating their desire to promote greater reverence to the Holy Eucharist.

So we find provision was made for the 'Lesser oblation,' the presentation of the Elements on the

altar at the offertory, together with the insertion of the word 'oblations' in the Prayer for the Church.[1] The rubric for a fresh consecration in case of necessity, which did not find a place in the Prayer Books of 1549, 1552, or 1558 (although there was a similar rubric in the 'Order of the Communion') shows the importance attached to consecration; while the fact that the consecration is to be effected by the words of institution only, seems to militate against the idea which appears prevalent of a general presence of Christ at the service, rather than under the consecrated veils of Bread and Wine, and to draw attention to these elements in their threefold relation to the *Sacramentum*, *res Sacramenti and virtus Sacramenti*, rather than to a theory which makes 'the Body and Blood in the Sacrament, not the *object* of the worship, but only the *occasion* of it.'[2] Greater reverence was shown again to the Blessed Sacrament by these revisers of 1662, by two rubrics, the one ordering that the remains of the consecrated elements should be covered with a fair linen cloth, and the other which provides for the reverent consumption of all that has been consecrated, without carrying it out of the Church.

As to the declaration on kneeling, sometimes called the Black Rubric, it is not patient of the Puritan meaning commonly assigned to it, at all

[1] See Luckock, *Studies in the History of the Prayer Book*, pp. 194, 195.

[2] Mozley, *Lectures and other Theological Papers*, p. 212.

events in its present form. The words of the Prayer Book of 1552, 'It is not meant thereby [*i.e.* by kneeling] that any adoration is doone or ought to be doone, eyther unto the sacramentall bread or wyne there bodily recyued, or unto any reall and essencial presence there beeyng of Christ's naturall fleshe and bloude,' being changed at the last revision to their present form 'corporal presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood.' While as to this somewhat ambiguous expression, 'Natural Flesh and Blood,' it may be noticed that the Council of Trent uses the same expression. 'Neither are these statements mutually destructive, that He our Saviour ever sitteth at the right hand of the Father, according *to the natural mode of existence* (*Juxta modum existendi naturalem*), and that nevertheless in many other places He is present to us in His own substance, sacramentally, by that method of existence, which although we can scarcely express in words, yet we can imagine to be possible to God.'[1]

To turn to the Thirty-nine Articles, we find statements bearing on Eucharistic doctrine in Articles XXV., XXVIII., XXIX., and XXX., for the full consideration of which such books as those of Bishop Forbes, or Bishop Gibson, or Tract 90 in the *Tracts for the Times*, should be consulted. As to the Twenty-eighth Article, which bears more

[1] *Conc. Trent. Sess.* xiii. ch. 1. See on the subject of the Black Rubric an exhaustive note by Pullan, *The Book of Common Prayer*, p. 316.

immediately on this subject, it must be remembered that the third paragraph, as we now have it, used to run in 1553 as follows: 'Forasmuch as the truth of man's nature requireth that the body of one and the self-same man cannot be at one time in diverse places, but must needs be in some one certain place: therefore the Body of Christ cannot be present at one time in many and diverse places. And because (as Holy Scripture doth teach) Christ was taken up into heaven, and there shall continue unto the end of the world, a faithful man ought not either to believe or openly to confess the real and bodily Presence (as they term it) of Christ's Flesh and Blood in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.' But in 1563 this paragraph was removed, and the present one substituted in its place, which is as follows: 'The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and Spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith.' The author of this paragraph was Bishop Geste (or Guest), who thus explains it: 'I suppose you have heard how ye Bishop of Glocestre found him selue greeved with ye plasynge of this adverb *onelye* in this article. The Body of Christ is gyven taken and eaten in ye Supper after an heavenly and spiritual manner only, bycause it did take awaye ye presence of Christ's Bodye in ye Sacrament, and privily noted me to take his part therein, and yeasterday in myn absence more playnely vouched

me for ye same. Whereas betwene him and me, I told him playnely that this word onelye in ye foresaid Article did not exclude ye presence of Christes Body from the Sacrament, but only ye grossenes and sensiblenes in ye receavinge thereof. For I saidd vnto him though he took Christes Bodye in his hand, receaved it with his mouth, and that corporally naturally reallye substantially and carnally as ye doctors doo write, yet did he not for all that see it, feale it, smell it, nor tast it. And therefore I told him I wadd speake against him herein, and ye raythe bycause *ye article was of myn own pennynge.* And yet I would not for all that denye therebye anything that I had spoken for ye Presence.'[1]

Bishop Forbes, in commenting on the words of the Article, says, 'One cannot exaggerate the importance of the words "*given*, *taken and* eaten." . . . The Body of Christ is first *given*, that is, by the Priest or rather by the great High-Priest, through the ministry of His earthly representative. It is next *taken* first into the hand of the communicant, therefore the Body is something external to him who takes it, it is objective and independent of anything in him. It is Christ's Body before he takes it. . . . It is given in a heavenly and spiritual manner, for the whole action is supernatural. It is taken in a heavenly and spiritual manner, for we

[1] Quoted in *Charge* by Bishop Hamilton, Appendix, p. 147. Rivington, 1867.

have here to do with the order of God, not the order of nature. It is eaten after a heavenly and spiritual manner, for it is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.'[1] Such is the rational interpretation and history of this statement in the Article; and as Bishop Gibson tells us, 'the opinions of the Edwardian Reformers, such as Cranmer and Ridley, on the subject of the Holy Communion, have nothing more than an historical interest for us. Destructively they performed a task for which we owe them a great debt, in courageously attacking the mediæval teaching on Transubstantiation. But the positive character impressed upon the Articles in regard to Eucharistic doctrine is not theirs; nor have their writings any claim to be regarded even as an *expositio contemporanea* of formularies, which in their present form belong to a later date, and to a time when much greater respect was shown to the ancient teaching of the Church.'[2]

As to Article XXIX., it is necessary before considering it to keep clearly in mind the distinction between *res Sacramenti* and *virtus Sacramenti*, and to note that while the heading of the Article speaks of the wicked which eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper, in the text of the Article itself we read only that 'the wicked . . . although they do carnally and visibly press with the teeth (as

[1] Bishop Forbes, *An Explanation of the XXXIX. Articles*, vol. ii. pp. 557, 558.

[2] *The XXXIX. Articles*, vol. ii. p. 647.

Saint Augustine saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise *are they partakers* of Christ, but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing.' Balancing this statement with the warnings of the Exhortation in the Prayer Book against unworthy Communion, it would seem that the Church of England allows that the wicked receive the *Sacramentum*, which would include the *res Sacramenti*, but do not receive the *virtus Sacramenti*. This is the conclusion to which Dr. Pusey arrives after an exhaustive examination of the whole subject: 'The Church of England, then, while as matter of belief she holds that the wicked are in no wise partakers of Christ, fully justifies the belief of those who hold that the wicked receive to their condemnation the Body and Blood of Christ, against which they sin. She does not formally require this to be held, but practically none could be warned more solemnly than the children of the Church of England of the awful peril of being, through unworthy Communion, guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ "their Redeemer." It may be that the conflict of belief on this point prevented her from laying down anything formally in her Articles, beyond this one warning, that the wicked cannot be partakers of Christ. The Exhortation leaves none unwarned.'[1]

[1] Dr. Pusey, *Real Presence*, pp. 311, 312. See also Bishop Gibson *in loco*, and Mozley, *Lectures*, Lecture xiv.

Lastly, there is the testimony of the Homilies, which is useful only so far as showing that the language of antiquity and of the Catholic Church finds a place in the authorised and approved statements of the Reformation; for it is not contended for one moment that we are bound to assent to every statement in these sermons—the Thirty-fifth Article indeed only asserts that they 'contain a godly and wholesome doctrine.'[1]

We find then at the close of the First Book of Homilies, in the notice of a further instalment, the phrase 'of the due receiving of His blessed Body and Blood under the form of Bread and Wine.' Again, 'In the Supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent.' Again, 'It is well known that the meat we seek for in this supper is spiritual food, the nourishment of our soul, a heavenly refection and not earthly; an invisible meat and not bodily; a ghostly substance and not carnal;'[2] and so once more, 'We shall be hereby the more ready to receive our Saviour and Maker in His Blessed Sacrament.'[3]

Such is the manner of the Presence, in so far as human understanding can penetrate the mystery. Over refinement of explanation has been, as we have seen, responsible for a great deal of contro-

[1] See Gibson, *The XXXIX. Articles*, vol. ii. pp. 726, 727.

[2] Homily of the Worthy Receiving of the Sacrament.

[3] Homily for Good Friday, *ad finem*. See generally, Bishop Collins, 'The Witness of the Homilies,' *The Church Historical Society Papers*, S.P.C.K.

versy and misunderstanding in divided Christendom; but the danger here in England seems rather to lie in a shrinking back from the consequence of our own beliefs, and to think that reverence precludes accurate faith, or that doctrinal precision is immaterial and uncalled for. It may be well to conclude this chapter with the testimony of some well-known theologians of our own time. First Bishop Hamilton, who says: 'I answer without hesitation, because I think the evidence I can produce is very clear, that our Church witnesses that through Consecration the Body and Blood of Christ become really present, and by this I mean "present *without us*," and not only "in the soul of the faithful receiver," or to use words very familiar to you, my Rev. Brethren, the Body and Blood of Christ are present *objective* and not *subjective* only.'[1] Again, Bishop Moberly: 'I will therefore only say that the ancient doctrine of the Church, and as I read it, the unquestionable doctrine of the Church of England, is that the spiritual presence of the body and blood of our Lord in the Holy Communion is objective and real.'[2] Thirdly, there is the testimony of Dr. Liddon, who says: 'Believing as we do that the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the

[1] Bishop Hamilton, *Charge*, 1867, pp. 74, 75.

[2] Bishop Moberly, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 171, edition 1868. It is only fair to add that the word 'objective,' which was used in the Lecture as delivered, was withdrawn in subsequent editions, on the ground that it was unnecessary. See cheap edition, 1904, p. 160.

Faithful in the Lord's Supper, we necessarily believe in that Real Presence of Christ in that Sacrament, since, unless He is really present, He cannot be taken and received at all, but we reject the Roman explanation of His presence.'[1] While a declaration, including the following statement on the doctrine of the Real Presence, was sent in 1867 to the Archbishop of Canterbury, signed by many clergy, including Dr. Pusey, Dr. Liddon, Canon Carter, Mr. Mackonochie, and Archdeacon Denison:

'(1) We repudiate the opinion of a "Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood"; that is to say, of the Presence of His Body and Blood as they "are in heaven"; and the conception of the mode of His Presence, which implies the physical change of the natural substances of Bread and Wine, commonly called "Transubstantiation."

'We believe that, in the Holy Eucharist, by virtue of the Consecration, through the Power of the Holy Ghost, the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ, "the inward Part, or Thing signified," are present, really and truly, but Spiritually and ineffably, under "the outward visible part or sign," or "form of Bread and Wine."'[2]

[1] Letter from Dr. Liddon in the *Times*, December 25, 1874.

[2] For the full text of this Memorial, see Bodington, *Books of Devotion*, Appendix I.

CHAPTER IV

THE TYPE OF THE MANNA

'Le Paradis, c'est une première communion qui dure toujours.'

'Voi altri pochi, che drizzaste il collo
Per tempo al pan degli angeli, del quale
Vivesi qui, ma non sen vien satollo.'

Enough has been said in the previous chapter to show that, whatever differences of belief may divide Churchmen as to the nature and mode of this wonderful Presence, yet not even Transubstantiation itself, as an attempt to explain the inexplicable, has, if rightly understood, anything carnal, material, or idolatrous about it. We shall have to consider this later on when we come to deal with Eucharistic adoration. In the meantime it may be well to recall ourselves from the arid fields of controversy to consider what this divine gift means to the soul, and to the development of the spiritual life. And perhaps we could not do this better than by following up the lines of one of those acknowledged types of the Blessed Sacrament which meet us in the Old Testament: for which we may

almost claim the sanction, at least in the way of suggestion and allusion, of our Blessed Lord Himself, for it will be remembered how in the discourse delivered at Capernaum on the subject of the Heavenly Food, which has been already considered, our Lord contrasted the gift which He was about to bestow, with all its power of immortality, with the manna, the heavenly food which symbolised it, with which every Jew was familiar in the sacred records of God's dealings with His people.

There is a full account of the feeding of the children of Israel with manna in Exodus xvi., which, in itself mysterious, we may take as symbolical of a greater mystery still, and use as a parable descriptive of a fuller feeding provided for a more pressing need; or at least use as furnishing some convenient heads under which to consider the Holy Communion as the food of the Christian.[1]

I

The manna and the Eucharist have this in common, that they both were provided as food for

[1] Dean Luckock, in speaking of Tell Hūm, and its identification with Capernaum, says: 'The lintel of the chief doorway (*i.e.* of the Synagogue) has a carving in the centre of a pot of manna, which is encircled with the vine and clusters of grapes . . . At the same time it helps to establish the Catholic interpretation of His teaching on the occasion as anticipatory of the Holy Eucharist. "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and are dead." "I am the Living Bread which came down from heaven."'—*Footprints of the Son of Man*, 'S. Mark,' vol. i. pp. 40, 41.

the journey;[1] the one for the journey through the wilderness to the promised land of Canaan, the other for the journey through the wilderness of this world, to the promised land of heaven.

And yet obvious as this may seem, the Holy Communion has before now almost ceased to be regarded as food at all, and with some people still partakes but little of this character in the economy of Christian life. Those who belong to an older generation will remember the time when the Holy Communion was regarded as a very rare event in the life of a Christian. It was looked upon more as the victor's Feast when the conquest was won than as food for the combatant in the shout and stress of battle. As a consequence the young and tempted were almost prohibited from approaching God's altar, even if they were so disposed, by the force of public opinion. It was regarded as the privilege of those who had much leisure and quiet so to approach, and of those who were removed at all events from the more obvious and pressing temptations of life; and who thus made an occasional concession to propriety, and in many cases, no doubt, an earnest and thankful participation in the spiritual joys of communion with Christ.

Now this old idea is rapidly passing away. Opportunities for receiving the Holy Communion are largely increased, Communions are much more

[1] See author's *Religion*, p. 251.

frequent, and a different class of Communicant is now found at the altar.

Young people, almost children,[1] receive the Blessed Sacrament; the tempted, the wearied, the sad, approach in the very crisis of their temptations and sorrows. The man of business associates his Communion with his daily task, and pleasure is regarded as no obstacle. There is Communion in the morning and the theatre in the evening.

Which of these two theories is right? Has the Ark of God been taken into battle with the Philistines? Or is it that the weary Israelite is gathering manna, the food for another toilsome day of monotonous journeying? No doubt, in theory, the timid soul who withdrew his Communion from his active life was wrong; and the tempted, weary soul which looked for the manna lying daily round the advancing host was right; albeit to him the obligation of a careful life and due and proper precautions, in the interest of reverence, would be much more severe.

It never can be easy, whether we eat or drink, or whatsoever we do, to do all to the glory of God. But, on the other hand, it can never be right to divide our life up into two parts, sacred and secular, as if it were a concert.

Our life is one, and we need to regard all its hours, those even which seem to be least marked

[1] For primitive Communion of infants not alluded to here, see Stone, *The Holy Communion*, chap. xii.

with the cross of consecration, to be sacred to God, and in need of His strengthening grace, that they may be blessed to their right end and purpose.

So it is that, rightly conceived and in view of its great final cause, the Holy Communion is found to be food for the way, not a feast at the end of life, food for the weary and tempted, not a reward for those who have overcome, so that we can understand the frame of mind which dictated the answer given by one who was questioned as to the reason of his frequent Communions: 'I receive often because I often sin.' It is the cry of the soul oppressed with its own weakness. 'When wilt thou come unto me: I will walk in my house with a perfect heart.'[1]

A second consideration would seem to be suggested by the type of the manna, in the fact that by God's own direction the Israelite was constrained to gather the food early: 'when the sun waxed hot, it melted.'[2] Of course it would be idle to take this as in any sense an authority for early Communion, even in a typical sense, and this is not the object for which it is now brought forward. But the one may be reasonably taken as suggesting the other, and perhaps there may be some underlying principle common to both, if it be only that God's gifts must be sought with alacrity and proper carefulness.

'O God, Thou art my God: early will I seek

[1] Psalm ci. 3. [2] Exod. xvi. 21.

Thee,'[1] is still the cry of the earnest Communicant, who does not think it a mark of reverence, but rather the contrary, to put off until the evening of his life devout sacramental Communion with his God. 'Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth'[2] is a more sound principle to act upon than the cautious unbelief of him who was afraid and went and hid his Lord's money. It is a sorry thing to withhold the freshness of our youth from God, and offer to Him only the worn-out remnant of a spent life.

But the early gathering of the manna may also suggest to us the value of those early Communions in the quiet morning before the sun of earthly cares and anxieties has arisen, when we seek to give God the first-fruits of our thoughts, our strength, our day.

In the discussions which take place from time to time as to Evening Communion (that unhappy product of latter day laxity, seized upon by some who would seek to depreciate the Sacrament), it is sometimes forgotten that quite apart from the question of Fasting Communion, it cannot be right that this sacred Feast should be attended at the fag-end of a day, spent in the usual pursuits of life, however innocent. Those who are careful to observe the fast before Communion are also careful not to read their letters, or mix in society, or join in conversation, which would prevent them from giving themselves

[1] Psalm lxiii. 1. [2] Eccles. xii. 1.

wholly and undistractedly to Communion with their Lord.

But the fast before Communion has too ancient and too universal a sanction behind it that it should be dismissed by a contemptuous reference to modern customs, and a supposed incapacity in the physical constitutions of men and women at the present day, who seem to be made of iron when in pursuit of pleasure, but only of glass when it concerns the service of God.

A doctor has lately told us: 'In the Church of England there is now little need that any sound and healthy man or woman should communicate after the fast has been broken. Celebrations of the Eucharist at a time before it can be necessary to take food are so universal that no one in good health can feel a strain upon his physical powers in communicating fasting. All that is wanted to keep the Church custom is good will, and a resolve not to be self-indulgent.'[1]

It would be well for those who wish to study this question dispassionately to read carefully *Concerning the Fast before Communion*, by Father Puller, and to recall at least these two authoritative statements. S. Augustine says in his first letter to Januarius: 'It clearly appears [from the account of S. Matthew's Gospel] that when the disciples first received the Body and Blood of the Lord, they did

[1] Dr. Wickham Legg, *Papal Faculties allowing food before Communion* (S. P. C. K.), p. 31.

not receive fasting. Must we, therefore, censure the universal Church because the Sacrament is always received by persons who are fasting? Nay, verily, for from that time [*i.e.* ever since that earliest period, the first part of the Apostolic Age] it has seemed good to the Holy Ghost that in honour of so great a Sacrament the Body of the Lord should enter the mouth of a Christian before other food; and it is for this reason that the custom referred to is observed throughout the whole world.'[1]

And reaching across the ages, our own Bishop Jeremy Taylor reminds us: 'Fasting before the Holy Sacrament is a custom of the Christian Church, and derived to us from great antiquity: and the use of it is, that we might express honour to the mystery by suffering nothing to enter into our mouths before the symbols.' And again, 'It is a Catholic custom that they who receive the Holy Communion should receive it fasting.'[2] It may readily be granted that there has been a disposition to insist on this law of the Church with a blind rigorism, which has pressed disastrously on invalids and on those of weak health. It has been the custom with such people to maintain that Fasting Communion is a law that admits of no dispensation, except by the Pope, but these dispensations

[1] First letter to Januarius, Ep. liv. 8.

[2] Jeremy Taylor, *The History of the Life and Death of the Holy Jesus*, II. xiii.; see also *Ductor Dubitantium*, III. iv., XV. i.

are issued by the Pope with some frequency and are in some cases of permanent force.[1] And it is well known that the opinion maintained by Dr. Pusey and many of the early Tractarians, who were by no means disposed to laxity in self-discipline, very strongly inclined to a merciful discrimination in this matter.

Dr. Pusey, at the end of a very interesting letter on this subject, written in 1879, says: 'I believe non-fasting Communion comes under our Blessed Lord's rule, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice"; and I feel sure that if He were here, He would dispense with the custom Himself in many cases; as of the weakly. I am certain that He would rather they communicated non-fasting than were starved'; but he goes on: 'I need not say that we old Tractarians communicated and communicate fasting, but we cannot lay the burden on the shoulders of the weak or sickly.'[2]

It may be well, however, to say that this is a matter in which, in the words of Father Puller, 'people ought not to take the dispensing power into their own hands'; and further, that if it be found necessary to take food before communicating, it should not have the form of an ordinary meal, but be taken in private and with prayer, as

[1] *Papal Faculties allowing food before Communion*, by Dr. Wickham Legg, S.P.C.K. See also Puller, *Concerning the Fast before Communion*, p. 43.

[2] *Spiritual Letters of E. B. Pusey*, p. 275.

long before the service as possible, and in the smallest quantities, with a humble protest to Almighty God that 'the spirit indeed is willing but the flesh is weak.'

To take another point in the parable which the manna suggests to us, we read that 'when the children of Israel saw it, they said one to another, It is manna: for they wist not what it was' [or, 'they said, What is it?'—R.V.].[1] This is a question which must often be on our lips, not only with regard to the Blessed Sacrament, but also with regard to many other of God's dealings with us—'What is it?' It is a commonplace with those who view with favour a hazy indistinctness in religious truth, that anything like a decisive answer to this question as to the Eucharistic mystery does not appear in the authorised formularies of the Church of England. We have already endeavoured to see how much truth and how much assumption there is in this contention. But it is not an unmixed good that God's promises should be treated as if they were visionary and illusive, or that they should be emptied as far as possible of anything which may prove a strain upon faith, or a challenge to the understanding. An indefinite belief as to the Eucharistic gift may prevent some awkward consequences of ecclesiastical controversy, and help a man to avoid such fiery trials as are provided for us by the less barbaric methods of

[1] Exod. xvi. 15.

modern civilisation; but it may well be questioned whether such an one does not suffer by his want of clearness, and whether he is not deprived of some special comfort which our Lord designed him to have. It was in itself a support to the toiling Apostles to know that our Lord's presence on the Lake,[1] as He walked on the water, was the presence of His own real personality, and not the mere phantasm of a spirit. And when they saw Him their whole attention was devoted to Him, Him they received into the ship, He it was Who calmed them, and brought the ship to land. They did not use the awe which they felt as an occasion which led them to worship Christ in heaven, but Christ Himself received their homage, however imperfect it may have been, as the proper object of it: and it was a comfort to them, and a source even of awe and dread, as S. Peter once found it, to have this knowledge, and not to wake up afterwards and say with Jacob, 'Surely the Lord is in this place; and I knew it not.'[2]

Neither is it for the best interests of our soul not to know as much as may be known of our Lord's condescension and the manner of His Presence. S. Paul's warnings, in the First Epistle to the Corinthian Church, suggest ignorance as playing a certain part in the profanity which had incurred God's wrath.[3] And it may be questioned whether

[1] S. John vi. 16, 21.
[2] Gen. xxviii. 16.
[3] 1 Cor., see chap. x., xi.

those who are most loud in their denunciations of such superstition as has followed on a disproportionate dwelling on certain aspects of the Sacramental mystery, have been as prompt as they should have been to denounce the profanity of those who treat these most sacred elements of the Lord's Presence as if they were ordinary bread and wine, not discerning the Lord's Body, receiving it with studied coldness, and even disrespect; with no outward reverence, no preparatory fast, with all the ritual which is expressive of contempt. Surely we do well to pray that we may always believe and hold as regards this great Sacrament all that Christ would have us believe and hold for the good of our souls, and the preservation of our soul and body unto everlasting life.

On the other hand, it must be remembered that the Sacramental Presence is and always must remain a mystery. Only let us understand what is meant by the term. 'The idea of secrecy or reserve,' says Bishop Lightfoot, 'disappears when *μυστήριον* is adopted into the Christian vocabulary by S. Paul; and the word signifies simply "a truth which was once hidden but now is revealed," "a truth which without special revelation would have been unknown."'[1] So Dr. Liddon in his exhaustive note on *μυστήριον* points out that whatever idea of incomprehensibleness may exist in its connotation that still this is only a portion of the full

[1] Lightfoot, *Coloss.* i. 26.

meaning of the suggestive term.[1] Still in the one sense and in the other there is that element of mystery in the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist which may not be ignored. The Sacramental Presence is a mystery in the sense that we receive it by revelation, and can only receive it with imperfect intellectual appreciation, and also that constituted as we are at present it must remain inexplicable, and incomprehensible.' So Cardinal Newman himself gives to us the authoritative Roman doctrine of the Real Presence. 'Our Lord is *in loco* in heaven, not (in the same sense) in the sacrament. He is present in the sacrament only in substance, *substantive*, and substance does not require or imply the occupation of place. But if place is excluded from the idea of the Sacramental Presence, therefore division or distance from heaven is excluded also, for distance implies a measurable interval, and such there cannot be except between places. Moreover, if the idea of distance is excluded, therefore is the idea of motion. Our Lord then neither descends from heaven upon our altars, nor moves when carried in procession. The visible species change their position, but He does not move. He is in the Holy Eucharist after the manner of a spirit. We do not know how; we have no parallel to the 'how' in our experience. We can only say that He is present, not according to the natural manner of bodies, but *sacramentally*. His Presence is sub-

[1] Liddon, *Notes on the Romans*, xi. 25.

stantial, spirit-wise, sacramental, an absolute mystery, not against reason, however, but against imagination, and must be received by faith.'[1] Once more, we say, 'Manna,' what is it?

In seeking one last point in the similitude before us, we read in the narrative 'the people shall go out and gather a certain rate every day:'[2] great stress being laid on the daily quest for a daily supply, with a special provision for the maintenance of the Sabbath rest: all pointing to a minute care, not without its bearing on the discipline of the recipient and as a test of obedience to a command, where human impatience might be supposed to cavil, and human self-assertion to doubt. The student of God's Word will be able to recall other instances of minute provisions attached to great benefactions; and for the purpose of the parable, it will not be wrong to draw from it a lesson of regularity and purpose in those who seek to benefit by this bounty which God has provided for them.

It follows almost as a natural consequence from the recognition of the Holy Communion as the food of the soul, that it should be sought for at all events with that sort of regularity which we attach to the supply of nourishment necessary for our growth and life, as distinct from a spasmodic and occasional participation of that which otherwise lies outside our normal spiritual development.

[1] Newman, *Via Media*, ii. 226. [2] Exod. xvi. 4.

We live in a time when opportunities for Communion are largely increased. In places where a daily or at least weekly Communion may now be had, an opportunity for receiving this sacred food was, within the memory of many, offered only once a month or once a quarter, and even less frequently. And there would seem to have sprung up with this a lightness of purpose, as regards the actual receiving of the Holy Sacrament, which needs the earnest attention of the devout Communicant. There is no question here of scanty or even of no preparation before receiving; that must be considered later; but rather the question of the proper place which the Holy Sacrament ought to take in the devout life, more especially with regard to these two points, regularity and frequency of reception.

First as regards regularity: the analogy of food, as has been already seen, suggests to the earnest soul that he must so bring his Communions into his life, and so receive this heavenly food, that he may grow thereby. Some may feel that the interval of a month should elapse between his Communions, some will feel that Sunday is no feast-day to him without its heavenly food, others may wish to approach more frequently still, while others will feel that their wants are met by the bare minimum of three times a year, prescribed by the rubric. The words of S. Augustine may be recalled in speaking of daily Communion, 'Let each do what according to his faith he firmly believes ought to be done;

for neither of them dishonour the body and blood of the Lord, but vie with one another in contending how to honour this most health-giving sacrament. For neither did Zachaeus and that Centurion either of them strive between themselves, or one of them set himself before the other; when the one joyfully received Christ into his house, the other said: "Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my sinful roof." Both honouring the Saviour in a different and as it were contrary way, both sad with sin, both obtained mercy. . . . For both he in honouring does not dare to receive daily, and he (the other) in honouring does not dare to abstain on any day. Contempt alone that food may not suffer, as may neither the manna, distaste.'[1]

Whatever a man purposes in his heart so let him do for his own edification, and as his spiritual guide directs, but there should be no levity of purpose as regards so great a Sacrament. A devotional writer has said, 'It is impossible to estimate the effect of one Communion less in the life of a Christian; there should be no light approach and no light giving up in that which ought to be the support of the framework of our whole spiritual life, and which cannot be pretermitted without damage to it, nor should be enterprised without special reason and purpose.'

It would be well also to think of the matter on the side, so to speak, of our Blessed Lord. We have

[1] First Letter to Januarius, Ep. liv. 4.

so accustomed ourselves to think of His compassion, love and mercy, and rightly so, that we forget sometimes that which is due to His honour and glory. We cannot read the narrative which S. Luke puts before us, of the dishonour done to Christ in the Pharisee's house,[1] without feeling that we sometimes sadly forget the honour due unto His name and the necessity which is laid upon us of performing the vows which we have made to Him. There is many a man who if he wishes to economise his time thinks that the economy can best be effected in the hours set apart for devotion: he would do better if he remembered that those moments which he has consecrated to God form a first charge upon his time. So with our Communions they are not lightly to be put aside by reason of an access of business or pleasure, or even from sheer disinclination. There is also this to be remembered in considering the duty of regularity in our Communions, that when the time for the marriage feast has arrived, the master of the house is angry if all the invited guests begin to make excuse.

There is the further question as to the frequency of Communion. What should be aimed at in this direction? How far is it right literally to follow the gatherer of the manna, and seek the food of immortality as the daily strength for a daily need?

An earnest plea has lately been put forth for the recognition of the duty of a more frequent Com-

[1] S. Luke vii. 36.

munion.[1] In it the writer points out and substantiates his statement with some interesting statistics, that we are quite wrong in supposing that frequent Communion is uncommon among Roman Catholics. It would be true perhaps to say that it is rare in the Eastern Church, but in the West this is far from being the case. The present Pope, Pius x., is quoted as desiring in a recent decree that the faithful should be invited to frequent and daily Communion, as a thing most earnestly desired by Christ our Lord and by the Catholic Church. In the Roman Mass also there occurs this rubric, 'Si qui sunt Communicandi in Missâ, *id quod optat ecclesia.*' It is quite true that in the tenth, eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries, and much later still, at all events in England, Communions were very rare. And among the reasons which Bishop Hedley alleges for this is, strange as it may seem, 'the gradual development of devotion to the Blessed Sacrament.'[2] Certainly there is a necessity of guarding against a treatment of the Blessed Sacrament which, starting with a feeling of reverence, militates against its proper use. Mr. Keble foresaw the danger when he spoke of the idea gaining ground of 'some special quasi-sacramental grace, connected with simply assisting devoutly at Mass, over and above that promised

[1] Coles, *Daily Communion.* Sermon. W. Knott, 1907.

[2] Hedley, *The Holy Eucharist*, p. 135. See the whole chapter on 'Frequent Communion.'

to all earnest and faithful prayer.'[1] While asserting the right and the privilege which the devout Churchman may claim of attending the Holy Eucharist without communicating on any given occasion, let us jealously maintain the great difference which exists between this and an actual Communion; the attitude of the Christian surely being the eagerness of one who would fain communicate on all and every occasion which is offered to him, but is held back either by ecclesiastical discipline or custom, or by innate reverence at the particular moment. Bishop Hedley quotes a maxim ascribed to S. Augustine in the Roman Catechism, which is surely a healthy one, 'So live that you may be able to receive daily.'[2] And certainly it would be a good thing if the earnest Christian associated himself daily with this Holy Sacrament, in the sense that if for reasons such as those mentioned above he were unable or unwilling to communicate, he might at least, either in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament or in the quiet of his own room, make a spiritual Communion part of his daily devotions.

[1] Keble, *Letters of Spiritual Counsel and Guidance*, p. 327. Third edition.

[2] Hedley, *The Holy Eucharist*, p. 143, quoting the Tridentine Catechism, II. iv. 58. The maxim is from *Serm.* lxxxiv. 3 in the Appendix to the Benedictine edition of S. Augustine's works. This sermon, including the maxim quoted above, is an extract from the treatise wrongly ascribed to S. Ambrose, *De Sacramentis*, v. 25.—[EDITOR.]

Such are some of the thoughts which the history of the manna provided in the wilderness suggests to us, associating the provision for a time of earthly trial with the higher provision for a greater spiritual need, as man passes through the wilderness of this world to his promised Canaan, where at last the manna will cease, and faith be lost in sight, in the fullness of Christ's presence, as the joy of the redeemed.

CHAPTER V

PREPARATION FOR HOLY COMMUNION

'Introduc viros domum, et occide victimas et instrue convivium, quoniam mecum sunt comesturi meridie.

'Dilectus meus mihi, et ego Illi, qui pascitur inter lilia.'

As we think over the unspeakable privilege which seems to be covenanted to us in this great mystery, the thought will arise, 'Who is sufficient for these things?' who is worthy of this great privilege and capable of welcoming so great a guest? And so accordingly, if we cannot acquiesce in the position that the Eucharistic Presence depends entirely on the faith of the recipient, so that given an utter absence of faith in priest and people there would be no special Presence at all, still great stress has always been laid, and not least in the advice given in the Book of Common Prayer, on devout preparation as a pre-requisite to the due receiving of the full and proper benefits promised to a devout Communicant. Much depends on it. No one would willingly incur the guilt of an unworthy Communion; and yet apart from this we all feel that it is possible to fall short of the highest

blessing, and as the Israelite gathered the manna 'every man according to his eating,'[1] so our faith and love, our purpose or intention, may be the measure of the fullness of the grace received, which Christ apportions to the spiritual appetite of the receiver.

Now this preparation, which, whether as a precaution or as a preliminary, plays so large a part in our Eucharistic life, may be considered under two heads as remote and proximate, and must demand from us very serious attention.

There is a rubric which, it may be, is necessary as a disciplinary provision, which yet jars upon us as deficient in the Eucharistic temper, which provides 'that every parishioner shall communicate at the least three times in the year, of which Easter shall be one.' There rises before us the vision of a roll-call, of an unwilling duty, of a spiritual excrescence on a life whose main activities run in another direction, in those who out of concession to custom or from an anxiety to conform to prejudice have erected an altar 'to the unknown God.'

The preparation for a devout Communion must surely be the preparation of a life, in the spirit of the precept quoted in the last chapter, 'So live that you may be able to receive daily.' If it be true that '*peccati pœna peccatum*' (sin is the punishment of sin), so it is also true '*gratiam pro gratiâ*,'[2]

[1] Exod. xvi. 18. [2] S. John i. 16.

one blessing rightly received is the foundation of another, the thanksgiving for one Eucharist is the preparation for the next. 'As many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God.'[1] His choicest Eucharistic gifts are for His friends, who have the capacity for heavenly things, and who will not betray the trust reposed in them, nor dissipate in unworthy channels the grace which they have received.

There is a life in Holy Scripture which furnishes us with an example of what he should be who would be near to Jesus Christ, namely the recorded life of the Apostle S. John, to whom appertained the title which he, the writer of the Fourth Gospel, reverently cherished, 'the disciple whom Jesus loved.' He was near the fire,[2] without being consumed; he was warmed and quickened by the divine love: a type of the earnest Communicant who goes from strength to strength, from grace to grace, helped forward to fresh revelations of love in the power of mercies received and favours bestowed as the reward of love.

In contemplating this unique friendship between S. John and his divine Master, it will be possible to trace some of those stages of the devout life which must be the remote preparation for every devout Communicant who aspires to receive the Body

[1] S. John i. 12.

[2] *Cf.* the apocryphal saying attributed to our Blessed Lord, 'He who is near Me is near the fire.'

and Blood of the Lord. Aristotle mentions as a definition of friendship 'kindliness between persons who reciprocate it,' adding that the feeling must be mutually known.[4] In this definition we have a recognition of the fact that agreement and sympathy form in some way the basis of friendship, leading us on to the thought that one who would seek to attain to the close union with Christ implied in the life of frequent Communion, must not only labour so to live that Christ may find less to condemn when He visits us, but may be able also by virtue of His own gifts to develop within the heart some of that sympathy which may lead us to seek to be called the friends of God.

So it was with S. John the beloved disciple. We cannot fail to see that there were in him certain gifts which, in the fostering hands of his divine Master, developed in him a power of reciprocating those aspirations which He Himself implanted, and of answering to the divine craving of the human heart of Jesus, in a manner which ripened into love. The divine Personality of Jesus Christ, we may reverently believe, bathed in all the unspeakable glory of the ever-present Godhead, found in this disciple a soul which could receive and endure the brightness of the revealed glory which streamed through the humanity. Instances have not been wanting of great men who have found themselves completely cut off from all companion-

[1] Aristotle's *Ethics*, viii. 2, 3.

ship with those among whom they have been forced to live, isolated by their very position, or the loftiness of their aims, or the wideness of their outlook. It must have been so with our Blessed Lord. 'I have trodden the wine-press alone; and of the people there was none with Me.'[1] 'How is it that ye do not understand.'[2] 'Are ye so without understanding also?'[3] 'Will ye also go away?'[4] 'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now.'[5] Again and again, as these utterances remind us, the divine soul seems to have been driven in upon itself, seeking in vain for sympathy, for receptivity, for common patience. But there was the one, the eagle-eyed S. John, who could, beyond the others, gaze without flinching at the rays of sunlight which led quivering up into the very heart of the Godhead. Where S. Matthew and S. Luke tell their sweet and simple story of the heavenly Babe and the blazing sky, of shepherds gazing at their new-born King, he looked deeper and beheld 'the Light and whence it flows,' in exultant joy. 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.'[6] Let the others speak of the solemn mission, still resounding in the Church, 'Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them

[1] Isa. lxiii. 3.
[2] S. Mark viii. 21.
[3] S. Mark vii. 18.
[4] S. John vi. 67.
[5] S. John xvi. 12.
[6] S. John i. 1.

into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost:'[1] he had searched deeper, he had heard from Nicodemus, he had heard from our Blessed Lord Himself, the great doctrine of the new birth by water and the Spirit. Let the others recount the solemn scene, when, scarce knowing what they did, they knelt to receive the bread which was the Body and the Cup which was the Blood, at the Last Supper; he had looked deeper; he remembers the words at Capernaum how the Bread of God is He Which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world.[2] On him had fallen, in an utterance never to be forgotten, the dread commission of remitting and retaining sins, which the Lord gave to His Church.[3] As if he had cherished up every word and weighed and sifted every action, he says by a magnificent hyperbole, that if the record of our Blessed Lord's actions were written the world itself would not suffice to contain the record.[4] Here surely is the example of one who had the reciprocity of friendship, and the power of sympathy which bound him to his Beloved. He could think, he could be serious, he could receive, he could understand. The revelation of spiritual things as they passed through to him would give back a return of sympathetic expression: 'Unto the place from whence the rivers come, thither they return

[1] S. Matt. xxviii. 19. R.V.
[2] S. John vi. 33.
[3] S. John xx. 22, 23.
[4] S. John xxi. 25.

again.'[1] And so the heart which would know something of sacramental joy, which would seek to answer with love to the divine condescension, should seek to place itself more constantly in the plane of the spiritual and the supernatural. It must not shrink from the scorn which is poured on the theological temper. It must not shrink from the weariness and the toil even, which precede spiritual manifestation. It is difficult to breathe for long the rarified air of heaven. Even Apostles slept on the Mount of Transfiguration and were overcome with fatigue during the supreme manifestation of agony in the Garden of Gethsemane. If we would know Christ and hope for the full dower of His blessing, we must have learned to think. It was well perhaps that in obedience to our teachers we made a regular practice of a fixed Communion at stated intervals. But we must guard against merely fulfilling a parochial qualification for being a recognised Churchman, and seek for a more intelligent and devout understanding of what is meant by our great privilege. There is no virtue in indistinct belief, or in mechanical compliance with a rule. And if we stop to think we must be patient enough to receive, and if we are willing to receive we must be prepared to endure all the consequences which flow from our belief. It may be that a more careful appreciation of the sacramental mystery may lead us to refashion our ways, to greater

[1] Eccles. i. 7.

strictness, and even to persecution and trouble. The disciple whom Jesus loves, and who would love Jesus, must never shrink from the consequences of his belief. He would fain know more of Him Who so frequently comes beneath his roof. And so he waits for His footstep, he listens for His approach; he gazes without flinching at mysteries which make all his earthly calculations stagger in a dizzy mist of glory, which only years of faithful practice will serve to adjust and steady. The earnest Communicant must prepare himself by ever keeping alive that thoughtful theological instinct which makes him sensitive to the heavenly approach, conscious of the heavenly vision, and aflame with the heavenly Presence.

The disciple whom Jesus loved would seem again to have been one who displayed the reciprocity of friendship in the possession and practice of a burning zeal, which rendered him a sympathetic 'worker together with' Christ. That zeal which burned in the heart of Him Who purified His Temple must have found a responsive echo in the impetuosity of the Son of Thunder afterwards to be chastened and moulded into Christian love. Here once more the heart which would prepare itself to receive the divine Guest would seek to lay at His feet the offering of a life devoted to His service, and zealous for His honour. 'Lord,' the devout Communicant would say, 'Thou deliveredst unto me five talents; behold, I have gained beside them

five talents more.'[1] It is a sorry thing to invite the Redeemer of the world into a heart dull and lifeless, with nothing of the enthusiasm of humanity burning within it. Enthusiasm, the divine within the man, should be there to welcome the Son of Man when He comes as the representative of human nature and the crown of its perfection. He should find in us who crave His friendship a fierce indignation against all that is bad, unworthy, or commonplace; an intense love for God's honour; and a fervent desire to spread His kingdom. There is a sad absence of Church patriotism in so many hearts whom Jesus vouchsafes to visit. We are, too often, as the city Meroz, which has closed its gates against the advancing hosts of the Lord.[2] The missionary armies of the Church push their forlorn hope into the hostile ranks of fierce heathendom, but no responsive sympathy is aroused. Martha is too busy with choral service, ritual, and decorations to waste time in sharing with the divine Master the sorrows and the joys of His kingdom. The enemy attacks the Church, the foundations of morality seem to be tottering, truth is being betrayed, and yet there is no zeal, no love, no enthusiasm in those who, day by day or week by week, constrain Christ to tarry with them. But surely He Who summoned the fishermen from their nets to catch men, Who called Matthew from the receipt of custom to levy tolls

[1] S. Matt. xxv. 20. [2] Judges v. 23.

for Him, and Saul with his burning impetuosity to push the confines of His kingdom to the limits of the world, seeks in those whom He designs to visit something of that zeal which He found in His servant S. John, who shared the secrets of His heart, and the sorrow of His rejection.

And the loving Saviour knows that He must ask for our patience. We must know something of 'the patient waiting for Christ,'[1] if we ask Him to abide with us.

> 'Whom he loves the most
> He seeks not oftenest nor wooes him long:
> But by denial quickens his desire,
> And in forgetting best remembers him,
> Till that man's heart grow humble and reaches out
> To the least glimmer of the feet of God,
> Grass on the mountain-tops, or the early note
> Of wildbirds in the hush before the day—
> Wherever sweetly in the ends of earth
> Are fragments of a peace, that knows not man.'[2]

Such patience was his who was 'another John,' equally impetuous with the Baptist himself. Without any special protestation of friendship or affection, he follows the divine Sufferer to the high-priest's house. Here he treasures up the words and actions of his Lord, now treated as a criminal, bound, and insulted, with the same reverence as that with which he had received the mysteries at Capernaum and the discourses of the first Eucharist. He follows quite naturally to the Cross; he is

[1] 2 Thess. iii. 5. [2] Myers, 'S. John Baptist.'

present at the complete emptying out of the divine Life in its association with death. He knows the depth of anguish in the parting of friends as he witnesses the earthly separation of our Lord from His Blessed Mother. He traces up Holy Scripture to its source, he sees and records mysteries. At the grave he is still there; after the Resurrection his eye is quickened to be the first to discern the Lord as morning broke over the Lake; and patiently he waits as all go on before him, to be the last of the apostolic band once more to see the Lord. The frequent Communicant no less has need of patience, in times of national apostasy, in times of Church degradation, when she is bound and insulted by her enemies. And not least in those times of dryness and depression, when the soul begins to doubt even of grace received, to believe in its own unbelief, to feel that it is all dark, without seeing Jesus walking on the boisterous water, without realising the inward Presence through the opposing veil of the Sacrament. The preparation of life is an aspect of the approach to the altar that we do not always stop to consider. We are so taken up with repairs which obviously hinder all progress, that we forget the positive side, 'steadfastly purposing to lead a new life.' It cannot be right aimlessly and mechanically to ask Christ to visit, in all the intimacy of sacramental union, a life which, even if it be free from disfiguring sin, is empty of Christian graces, lacking in purpose, and not

such as could ever hope to answer with responsive devotion to the full dower of love which He is waiting to bestow.

It may not be amiss, therefore, at the end of this chapter to consider the value of intention as part of the preparation for receiving aright the Holy Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.

The devout Communicant will readily see that there should be an intention in every Communion which he makes. To ask Christ to come to the soul is a serious request for a serious purpose to be enterprised seriously. And further, at the moment of and in connection with the pleading of the Holy Sacrifice, as will be considered in a later chapter, there is the pledge of a full and all-sufficient grace. 'He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?' [1]

Every one who approaches to the Holy Sacrament, whether he be priest or layman, should have first of all the general intention of doing that which the Church intends to be done. The Holy Eucharist is the offering to God of the Church's Liturgy, her great public act of worship, and the Communion is the feast on the Sacrifice. So the celebrant is robed in distinctive vestments, generally symbolical of the dignity of the rite, in particular symbolical of Christ and the Sacrifice of Calvary. And the Communicant no less must be mystically clad with the

[1] Rom. viii. 32.

vestments of service; in the words of S. Paul, he must 'put on Christ.' Like Aaron and Hur on the mountain,[1] the Communicants must be upholding the hands of Moses, while the battle with Amalek still rages in the valley beneath. Does the life of sacrifice make itself felt in the earnestness and purpose of those who plead the Sacrifice? Is the altar consecrating social life, or does social life impair the seriousness of the Communicant? Is Christ invited to the marriage feast, or is the traffic of sheep and oxen brought into the temple? Of old we read how the early Christians used to carry about with them everywhere the sign of the Cross: at every step and every movement, going out and coming in, dressing and putting on their sandals, at the bath, at the board, when lamps were lighted, when they lay down to rest, when they seated themselves for their daily task, whatever call of ordinary life engaged them, the holy sign by incessant use was, as it were, worn into their foreheads.[2] And we cannot but contrast with this the light 'hearing of Mass' by careless and worldly courtiers in the midst of their sin, by brigands before committing murder, by those who observe the obligation of a roll-call imposed by the Church. This is not to approach with the intention with which the Church offers her stately service of devout homage. It is Herod keeping S. John Baptist near him, while he hesitates to

[1] Exod. xvii. 12. [2] Tertullian, *de Cor. Mil.*, ch. iii.

break off his sin. It is Pharaoh sending for Moses in fear of the consequences of rebellion against God. This is not to plead the Sacrifice, nor to receive the divine Victim. This is not to join in the worship of the faithful; but it is to blunt the purpose of the Church with the frivolity of the world.

But besides this general intention of associating ourselves with the great object set before us, there are particular intentions which help us to keep from the aimless frequenting of a mechanical service. 'Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you,'[1] has nowhere such a depth of meaning and such a promise of fulfilment as in this service of divine intercession. And there are many and pressing needs which day by day bring us to the throne of grace, for the world, for the empire, for the Church. A distinct call comes to us each time we approach the altar to do so with the special intention of obtaining, if it be God's will, this or that favour from Him Who is always more ready to hear than we to pray.

The whole question of intercession is a difficult one, why God the Almighty should so ask His creatures to 'come between' causes and effects, His will and the fulfilment of it, man and the consequence of his actions; why we, God's creatures, conscious of our weakness and unworthiness should

[1] S. Luke xi. 9.

presume to think that we should be heard for the asking. And yet there is not only the promise of a reward following on obedience to duty, but there is a command laid upon us as if in so doing we were fulfilling a necessary part of the economy of God's good Providence. But as affecting our preparation for drawing near to the altar, the question is rather this: if we are invited to come with the intention of obtaining blessings for ourselves or others, should there not be an earnest effort on our part to make ourselves in some sense worthy of thus interceding with God? My intercession means that I believe myself strong enough, earnest enough, and worthy to be heard by God in the request which I make to Him, beyond and above, and even in opposition to that which seems to be His set purpose, or the natural trend of events, or the inevitable sequence of cause and effect. Must I not labour therefore to make the incongruity of my interference less conspicuous, as I bring the infirmity of my purpose to bear on the desperate earnestness of the sinner, and the steady march of advancing destiny? Men who interceded with effect in Holy Scripture were men like Abraham, or Elias, or S. Paul. If I am to offer the Holy Sacrifice with the intention of obtaining through those priceless merits that which I could never obtain by my own most perfect and earnest efforts, at least I must learn to make myself one who is not utterly unfit to associate myself with the divine

pleading, and to feel that my intercession is not a light repetition of a few stated prayers with a faint hope of obtaining from God some mercy which I seek, but a real coming between God and certain great difficulties and obstacles of life, trusting in Him to grant what I ask, because I am able to associate myself with the divine Victim, to plead His merits, and to claim His grace.[1]

And this direction of the intention in every Eucharist will serve even more powerfully to the growth of the spiritual life within, which more than anything else, as we have seen, is the best preparation for a devout Communion. Each time we approach the altar we may approach with the intention of seeking for ourselves an increase of grace, a strength against evil, and a fresh access of purpose to our life. There is a great danger of settling down into a groove, in which there is no progress and no improvement: sins and imperfections mar the life, they are perfectly well known, reckoned in and accounted for, until there ceases to be any real effort to expel them. They have become domesticated; their presence excites no surprise. Heredity accounts for a good many; the natural disposition to certain evil desires and passions is regarded as a sufficient counterpoise to the effects of divine grace. And a man who believes, or professes to believe, in the omnipotence

[1] See author's *Counsels of Faith and Practice*, Sermon ix.

of God sits down vanquished, a contented vassal to the tyranny of some hereditary disposition. Past weakness accounts for other imperfections: uniformly to have acted in one way, although manifestly short of the best, is a reason for continuing to act in the same way still, until habit has worked its deep rut in the soul from which the wheel of life cannot extricate itself.

Society, public opinion, fashion, custom, whatever be the precise way in which environment asserts itself, contributes also its deadening effect. Nothing is more common than to find Christian men and women who have deliberately closed the door to any advance or improvement: their religious habits are formed; they do certain actions, follow certain religious precepts, allow themselves certain indulgences, but the sermon has yet to be preached, the book to be written, the advice to be proffered, which will cause them to move out of the hard routine which is an enemy to all growth. Against such a stagnation as this the devout Communicant should ever be directing the intention with which he receives the Body and Blood of the Lord. This sacred food is to minister to his growth, to check decay and quicken life. Day by day he will offer to God those imperfections which he knows to be the weak points in his character, but which he refuses to tolerate as something insignificant and also incurable. He will never rest until he has made

the religious actions of his life, including his Communions, more worthy of Him to Whom they are offered, treasures from which he may bring forth gold and frankincense and myrrh; so seeking to make his life less unworthy of the Heavenly Guest, to prepare the water for His feet Who so wearily has sought us, the kiss of welcome as from friend to friend, the sweet ointment of service to Him to Whom is due the costliest offering which we can bring. It will be a sorry thing indeed if multiplied Communions mean only the familiarity of custom, aggravating still more the listlessness of a life which has lost both earnestness and love. The true preparation for our Communions will be found in the devout life, which daily seeks to grow more and more like to the divine Example, and to this end offers the intention of a more perfect conformity to His will, and a more serious opposition to all that is unworthy of His Presence.

CHAPTER VI

THE PREPARATION—(*continued*)

'Amplius lava me ab iniquitate mea.'

We are left in no sort of doubt as to the mind of the Church of England, with reference to the necessity of preparation before Communion on the part of those who would receive not only the Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood, but also the reality and benefits of that Sacrament.

We must not content ourselves, that is to say, with a general preparedness, such as that contemplated in the last chapter, but there must also be a particular preparation. The words of the Prayer Book are explicit—

'Which being so divine and comfortable a thing to them who receive it worthily, and so dangerous to them that will presume to receive it unworthily; my duty is to exhort you in the mean season to consider the dignity of that holy mystery, and the great peril of the unworthy receiving thereof; and so to search and examine your own consciences (and that not lightly, and after

the manner of dissemblers with God; but so) that ye may come holy and clean to such a heavenly Feast, in the marriage-garment required by God in Holy Scripture, and be received as worthy partakers of that Holy Table.

'The way and means thereto is: First, to examine your lives and conversations by the rule of God's commandments; and whereinsoever ye shall perceive yourselves to have offended, either by will, word, or deed, there to bewail your own sinfulness, and to confess yourselves to Almighty God, with full purpose of amendment of life. And if ye shall perceive your offences to be such as are not only against God, but also against your neighbours; then ye shall reconcile yourselves unto them; being ready to make restitution and satisfaction, according to the uttermost of your powers, for all injuries and wrongs done by you to any other; and being likewise ready to forgive others that have offended you, as ye would have forgiveness of your offences at God's hand: for otherwise the receiving of the Holy Communion doth nothing else but increase your damnation. Therefore if any of you be a blasphemer of God, an hinderer or slanderer of His Word, an adulterer, or be in malice, or envy, or in any other grievous crime, repent you of your sins, or else come not to that Holy Table; lest, after the taking of that Holy Sacrament, the devil enter into you, as he entered into Judas, and fill you full of all iniquities, and bring you to destruction both

of body and soul. And because it is requisite, that no man should come to the Holy Communion, but with a full trust in God's mercy, and with a quiet conscience; therefore if there be any of you, who by this means cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned minister of God's Word, and open his grief; that by the ministry of God's Holy Word he may receive the benefit of Absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness.'[1]

This portion of the Exhortation to Holy Communion is quoted at length because it is important as showing the mind of the Church, and also because it is seldom read publicly at the present day, as ordered, either from lack of time, or, it must be feared, in some cases, from a dislike to the theological deductions which necessarily follow from its concluding paragraph. The position here assumed, and the doctrine of Confession which flows from it, have been already considered at some length in a previous volume of this series[2] to which the reader is referred. The remarks which follow are more general, but assume the position already

[1] Book of Common Prayer, Exhortation to Holy Communion. Compare also the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. and the 'Order of the Communion.'

[2] The author, *Church Catechism*, p. 313 and ff.

taken up in the volume alluded to, and are intended to amplify and apply them.

The advice given in the Exhortation quoted above resolves itself mainly into this, that the devout Communicant must be assured of these two things: First, that he stands in a right relation to God, as far as he can secure by his conduct such a position; and secondly, that he is in no way violating the law of love with regard to his neighbour, which is essential to his acceptance with God, and is an absolute condition to his receiving the benefits of the Sacrament.

The means whereby this knowledge is to be obtained is self-examination: a religious exercise which rests on a precept of S. Paul's,[1] and is recommended not only in the Prayer Book, but in almost every devotional book which deals with this subject. Like so many other counsels of spiritual value, it is liable not only to actual neglect, but to misuse by the over-sensitive conscience. The principle which underlies self-examination is, so to speak, of a thorough business-like nature. This is a characteristic of all the requirements and precepts advanced by the Church. They are based on sound principles of practical utility which it is not well to neglect. Every business man knows the advantage of examination, if his work is not to suffer damage. The express train as it stands in the station after a long run is subjected to an

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 28.

examination in every wheel, not because any flaw is detected which renders this necessary, but because after the wear and tear and friction which it has experienced the possibility of damage must be provided for. The ship which has been cruising in many waters, after a long time at sea, is put into dock to repair defects and to undergo scrutiny. No man who values his commercial soundness is content without a periodical examination of how he stands financially. So whether we examine ourselves or not, it is almost certain that we require it. The delicate nature which belongs to us, with its heredity and its sensitiveness to environment, needs watching. The friction of daily life is tremendous, the blindness which lulls us to security is phenomenal. Conscience may very easily become warped, or remain unimpressed, and David may be weighed down with a heavy spiritual disease, which it needs a Nathan to discover to him; or a S. Peter may believe himself to be already Cephas, when as yet the shifting sand of an irresolute will has not been cleared away from him.

It is well that we should look at self-examination, what it is, and why it is, lest it should remain only an expression and nothing more, or even be a snare to us, as representing what we believe to be a duty, which we leave habitually undone. Or it may become, like the nervous questioning of the valetudinarian, who is always discovering imaginary diseases, and at last ceases to feel security in a

normal life of health, as being only due to the ignorance which has failed to discover the forces of death. What is self-examination? To many people it represents a minute torture by self-questioning according to long lists put forward in books of devotion, which represent to him, in many cases, sins to which he has no temptation, and in others, forms of evil which it is best not to dwell upon. It may be that such questions are necessary when the sinner for the first time is beginning to consider his state before God. The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked. He knows, it may be, some conspicuous evil which overshadows his life; he knows nothing of the contributory causes which have set it up, nor of other sins which have been growing up under its shadow. The commandments of God represent to him certain notorious and obvious prohibitions of well-defined sins, and he does not stop to follow such an amplification or analysis as that which our Lord put forth in the Sermon on the Mount. The questions in books of devotion alluded to above may well play the part of Nathan to rouse David, or supply the information which, through ignorance or carelessness, has hitherto been withheld from the conscience. But to the ordinary Christian it would not be necessary, frequently at least, or as an ordinary thing, thus to question himself. The conscience of one who is living, or trying to live, near to God is sufficiently sensitive to register, as it were,

automatically the production of a sin. The soul would be as conscious of a lapse into sin as the body would be of a blow received. And generally such a man as we have supposed would long since have been able to classify his temptations, to dismiss some as inapplicable. For instance a common theft, as a temptation, would not appeal to a gentleman, nor violent anger to the tender-hearted; some have nothing but repugnance to intemperance, and some are not disposed to lie. Accordingly he has dismissed these: it is not even a source of credit to him that he has kept from sins to which he has neither affinity nor temptation. And he confines his examination to those especially which a long and painful experience has told him are always trying to assert themselves and work his ruin. With a keen desire to be free, he makes but little progress, and there is always the danger of the strong man armed taking up his abode, as one who cannot be dislodged from the soul, a tolerated if hated intruder.

Here will be seen the importance of business-like habits in spiritual as well as in temporal matters. A self-examination as to these sins which are for ever asserting themselves must be something more than the unwelcome assurance that the ills are still there. It must not be another example of the man who beholds his natural face in the glass, and then goes his way to forget what he had seen, and to neglect to rectify what he knew to be

amiss.[1] The examination must be systematic, for a purpose, and followed by action. Each night it would be well to pass in review the day, and to note any failure in these matters which has taken place. It would be well carefully to note it down, with, if necessary, any steps which led up to the fall. And then at stated intervals, when preparation is being made for Confession, or for some special Communion, to note the frequency with which such defections had occurred. The desire of the soul is to free itself, to be entirely delivered from the bondage; and without some such careful reckoning, it is possible either to think the lapses more frequent than they really were, and so to be discouraged; or else to live in a fool's paradise, and say Peace, Peace, when there is no peace; and further, to forget that not only a general sinfulness is repugnant to Almighty God, but that every separate fall is a blow struck against His Majesty, and is contributing towards the dread slavery of habit against which the soul must ever be contending.

But with all this it is most important to avoid scrupulosity. It is part of the malice of Satan, if he cannot goad us into sin, at least to make us go heavily under a sense of supposed guilt. There are some people who seem to think it a virtue to suppose that everything they do is wrong: and the soul loses its spring and freshness, the strength of its joy. We ought to

[1] S. James i. 23, 24.

contemplate days in which there has been no deliberate and wilful sin. So each day we pray, 'Vouchsafe, O Lord : to keep us this day without sin.' So we pray, 'Grant that this day we fall into no sin, neither run into any kind of danger ; but that all our doings may be ordered by Thy governance, to do always that is righteous in Thy sight.' There must be a possibility of accomplishing that which we pray for. And scrupulosity is to the soul what hypochondria is to the nervous system, it has a tendency to produce the very evils which at first it only simulated ; while the scruples form the very pebble in the shoe which hinders progress, or at least makes the heart of the righteous sad, where God would have us rejoice.

As the result of this self-examination, still following the directions of the Prayer Book Exhortation, we are led to Confession. Great stress is laid upon this, either immediately to God, or mediately before His priest. So much discussion has been raised from time to time about what is technically known as Confession, that men sometimes forget that there is no sort of question as to the need of confessing our sins to God in one way or the other. Some would try and combine the two processes, without the self-abasement of a confession of sins, and gain the Absolution which they believe in, out of the public services after a confession of general sinfulness, with no particular confession, or even consciousness of sins. It cannot be contended that this

was seriously meant, even allowing it to be possible under certain conditions, by those who put the Confession and Absolution where they are. The preparation and the confession and the steps to amendment are regarded, not as taking place in church at the time of the Communion, but in 'the meantime' between the Exhortation on the Sunday or Holy Day preceding and the day of Communion. Contrition, confession, satisfaction represent a severe and definite process, very different from the general Confession and wide Absolution, pronounced for the purpose of a more sanctified approach to God in the service, over the previously absolved and unabsolved alike.

There is no doubt that people are being frightened away from a salutary and most comfortable ordinance by misrepresentations unworthy of those who make them, and detrimental to those who listen to them. The underlying and fundamental question is, Has God given 'power, and commandment, to His ministers to declare and pronounce to His people, being penitent, the Absolution and Remission of their sins'? There can be but one answer to those who accept the statement of S. John, and the solemn words of ordination as set forth in the Prayer Book.[1]

If priests have this power, the one absorbing question would be, When and where and how can I avail myself of it?

[1] S. John xx. 22, 23; Prayer Book, Ordination of Priests.

But the thought arises, How can a man forgive sins? Is this possible? Can it be asserted without blasphemy? To which the answer would be given at once, that no man can possibly forgive sins, it is an attribute of God alone; but that man can be the turnkey for all that, to unlock the prison door, and send forth the captive free, whose pardon has been pronounced by the authority of the Sovereign, Who alone is the fount and source of justice. It might further be asserted that so far from being unexpected that such power should be given to men, it is only a mark of God's special kindness. Man can sympathise, man is a sinner himself, man can soothe and rebuke; he can give that which the penitent soul so utterly craves, the voice of assurance, the response to his longing for encouragement. 'I am heartily sorry, grieved, and worn down by the burden of my sins, which are intolerable and overwhelming. I know that I may be forgiven, but, O God, tell me so.' And to this craving there comes the response through the sympathetic mouth of a man, 'Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more.'[1] 'By His authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins.'[2] But the first thought of the sinner when he hears of this healing pool of Bethesda is not to seek for some one to put him into the life-giving waters; but from a

[1] S. John viii. 11.

[2] Prayer Book, The Visitation of the Sick.

nervous shrinking from his sins, from a dread of facing them in a concrete form, which is the result of putting his evil actions into words, he casts about, not for reasons which should make it clear to him why he should avail himself of this great blessing, but for every reason which shall relieve him of an operation which he dreads, and allow him to go on doctoring himself, while the mischief grows, and the smart becomes incurable.[1] What are the reasons why I should not go to Confession? is the form in which he faces this great question, and tries dispassionately to examine the remedy which he needs and really longs for, but whose sharpness and severity he nervously dreads. Confession, he tries to believe, is bound up with false doctrine repudiated at the Reformation. No one would surely wish to say that any given doctrine or practice is false because it is common to Roman Catholics equally with ourselves. The Church of England at the Reformation did not, and indeed could not, repudiate Absolution, but she was within her rights when she regulated the precedent Confession, and simplified her penitentiary rules. It has been usual to say that the difference between the attitude of the Church of England before and after the Reformation is the difference between 'must' and 'may'; between the decree of the Lateran Council of 1215, enacting that all the faithful, men and women, shall confess

[1] On this subject generally, see author's *Priestly Ideals*, Lecture iii.

their sins at least once a year to their pastors,[1] and the general permission to use Confession or not to use it, as given us in the Exhortation quoted above, or more fully in that version of it which appeared in the 'Order of the Communion' and in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. If a man has once satisfied himself that Absolution is a divine remedy for the disease of sin, he is not to be deterred from accepting it because it is a remedy also used by those with whom in other particulars he is in disagreement.

But the anxious sinner, when he finds that there is no sufficient doctrinal reason to deter him from the healing smart of Confession, has not far to seek other reasons against the use of it, which may justify him in the shrinking which he feels. It is suggested to him by those who evidently have at heart his moral and spiritual welfare that Confession is a medicine and not food; that it cannot be healthy thus to treat as a normal remedy that which was evidently meant to be abnormal and for extraordinary crises of life. No healthy man can live on medicine, and so frequently to use an exceptional and medicinal power is to weaken its healing force, as well as to damage health. It is generally acknowledged to be difficult to press analogies, and it is possible that we do not know so much about diseases of the soul and their remedies

[1] 'Omnes utriusque sexus fidelis, postquam ad annos discretionis pervenerit, omnia sua solus peccata confiteatur fideliter, saltem semel in anno, proprio sacerdoti.'

as we do about the body. But, even if we continue this illustration, is it not true that there are some portions of the world where it is difficult to maintain human life in health, where the distinction between medicine and food is not so sharp as would be required by the analogy? A European visiting the swamps of West or Central Africa would rather leave many other things behind than his medicine chest. There are some forms of drug which are almost a necessity to his life in the conditions in which he finds himself. It is possible that the conditions of life also in a fallen world render necessary a constant recourse to a divine help, which may not be inaptly described as medicine, but certainly in some cases is as necessary as food. 'At least, the constant recourse to a priest weakens the character.' But why? Sin weakens the character, but confession of sins will not do so, and never can. There is a confusion here between the confession of sins as a precedent to Absolution, and the direction, or advice, reproof, or encouragement which may or may not be given by him whose duty it is to receive the Confession. Over-direction may be an evil, but direction is by no means confined to the time of private Confession. There are some of those who are most loud in their denunciations of this ordinance who yet are habitually seeking advice and direction from friends, clerical and lay, on matters which they could well settle for themselves, and in cases where the direction they needed

was direction of conscience enabling them to act for themselves, and not the leading-strings of another's counsels, or the bondage of another's will. 'At least it must be dangerous to self-respect, or even modesty, to confess to another the intimate sins known only to God, or at all events to a few.' Here again all that is said as to the so-called 'filthy confessional' may he pushed on one side either as a gross calumny, or as proceeding from an ignorant conception which supposes Confession to be a cross-examination of the penitent on the part of the priest, instead of the hearing of such sins as form the burden of the Confession which the penitent has to make. All that is filthy might equally take place, supposing this filthiness on the part of priest or penitent to exist, in the Confirmation class, the ordinary interview, the letter of advice, and in any other way in which those who are possessed by unclean spirits seek to satisfy their morbid and hideous cravings. And it may well be asked, Why is the subject of every Confession to be supposed to turn inevitably on sins which come under the head of the seventh commandment? There are in the common classification of sins seven known as deadly, of which impurity is one, and there are many Confessions into which it never enters at all; and some of the sins which are most fatal to the life of the soul are spiritual sins, sins of pride and anger, which have nothing to do with a common but by no means universal form of the soul's

malady. But even granted that something terrible and disgraceful has to be confessed, have not similar disclosures to be made to doctors with a view to remedy? In these days of surgical operations, in which men and women submit to most humiliating conditions in order to purchase a few more years of life and health, can it be said with sincerity that it is impossible to impart without degradation the sad tale of spiritual disease which is ruining the soul to one who is constrained to act as the servant of the God of Purity and Truth? Once more, is the help of a solicitor to be refused in a complicated and delicate business because he has to be made the confidant of disagreeable secrets? 'There is a shame that bringeth sin: and there is a shame which is glory and grace.'[1]

'Even if this be true, I must respect the sincere objections of friends who would dissuade me from it.' Certainly Christ will accept no religious action, even if it may be labelled Corban, to the detriment of home duties and home obligations. But there are other sayings of Christ which have to be put in the balance with this; and those who have passed out of the years of tutelage have at least a right to their own opinions, and are the best judges as to the management of their own soul. Still it would be a sorry thing to seek God's pledged forgiveness for the sins of life by a process which involves wilfulness or even deceit in the procuring

[1] Ecclesiasticus iv. 21.

of it, and seeks forgivenness of sin by acts of sinfulness.

It is surely a more wise and profitable inquiry to seek out, not the reasons which suggest why I should not make proof of God's covenanted promise of Absolution, but rather the reasons why I should.

And here there stands out first of all the power which underlies the word Absolution itself. We take a long time to learn the enormous strength of sin. If we set ourselves to consider the grace and force of Absolution rather than the humiliation and bitterness of Confession, there would be far fewer attempts to be wiser than the Church, and to practise self-healing in cases which manifestly need the doctor, and where in all cases no one would be the worse for his help.

It is no use concealing the fact, which any priest of experience would endorse, that there are some sins and some cases of sin which can only be cured by Absolution. Just as there are some bodily diseases of which you would say at once, This needs the surgeon, nothing can be done without his aid; so there are certain spiritual cases which a man cannot treat without the special cure which God so provides. There are certain sins which from their extreme malignancy take such hold upon the sinner that he cannot look up. They have to be cut away, not once, but again, and even then their deadly poison is apt to reassert itself. And there are certain cases where, even if the sin itself is not of the worst type,

yet the long continuous habit has attained such power, that God's special grace alone can sever the chain. This is the especial virtue of Absolution. Every one knows the force of habit even in little things. One course of action long persisted in bends and warps the will until it becomes a slave instead of a master. Certain passions or desires have been allowed to assert themselves, and the whole life is bowed and distorted before them, just as trees which are on some storm-swept height, where the gale rushes in from the sea, will take a permanent bend, with branches all violently contorted in one direction under the force of the prevailing wind.

Absolution, as its very name implies, is the breaking of the chain, the unloosing of habit. There is many a man who is crushed to the earth by habits of sin against which he believes himself to be powerless; and it is when he is in the grip of this sense of his own impotence that God meets him with that spiritual gift which severs the chain of habit, so that, even if through human frailty he fall back, his sin is but a single action, and not another link in the fated series.

And this is not the only reason which should serve to impel the sinner to trust God Who thus offers him a good gift, and not to suspect harm under the guise of beneficence. It is not easy to feel the contrition which we wish for the sins whereby we have offended God's Majesty. Anything which will lead us to face those sins as they

are, which will help us to feel shame for them, and their true heinousness in God's sight, will help us towards a more perfect contrition, and to realise what was in the mind of the Church in thus bringing the great penitential system of her early years, so burdensome and so severe, within the reach of every one who, feeling the burden of his sins and the shame which belongs to them, is enabled to find all the consolations of the Church without the rigour of public penance.

Having said this much, it would be idle to deny that the penitential system of the Church even in this modified form is liable to abuse. The danger, however, now lies in another direction. In the old days the sternness of the discipline was such as might deter any but the most earnest penitent; the punishment was long and the relief not immediate; for some sins no penance availed, except after a very long period and with difficulty, and for none could it be repeated. So Hooker says: 'Private and voluntary repentance' (under which term he includes confession) 'was of far more general use, whereas public was incident unto few, and not oftener than once incident to any.'[1] Whereas at the present day the danger rather lies in the easiness of it. There is a real danger of keeping as it were to a life of sin with occasional times of relief from

[1] *Eccles. Pol.*, VI. iv. § 11. See also author's *Church Catechism*, p. 315 and ff.

the sense of guilt and the accumulated burden of sins committed.

This of course is not really possible, but the sinner may trade upon the easy comfort which it might be supposed to produce. Absolution does not work mechanically; God is not mocked. A life in which no progress against sin is either realised or desired is failing in those conditions on which alone man is capable of receiving divine forgiveness. There must be no playing in and out between sin and its pardon, and no using of penance as an anodyne to the pain of a wounded conscience. Here the levity of man is at fault, not the strong and benevolent purpose of God.

And no one can fail to notice the stress which is laid on forgiveness of injuries, on kindness and forbearance, on love in our dealings with our neighbour, as an essential part of the preparation for a good Communion. In the preliminary rubric to the Communion Office, in the Exhortation to Communion, and again in the Catechism, this is insisted on. So much of sin is anti-social in its effects; and it is impossible for one to seek the altar of God, hoping to receive a benefit, who has injured his neighbour by such sins as anger, pride, envy, or some forms of lust or avarice; while even gluttony and sloth may easily deprive society of the active benevolence which we owe to our fellow-men. Negatively the devout Communicant must zealously guard against anything which is a breach of the

law of love; positively he must do all in his power to minister to his brother's welfare, and help his brother's need. The long intercessions which form so prominent a feature in all liturgies would suggest this, and the provision for collecting alms for the relief of those in want is also significant.

The preparation of the Communicant becomes therefore a subject only second in importance to a right faith in the divine nature of the gift which he is privileged to receive.

CHAPTER VII

THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE

'O salutaris Hostia,
Quæ cœli pandis ostium
Bella premunt hostilia
Da robur, fer auxilium.'

THERE are few subjects on which there is greater misapprehension than the Christian Sacrifice of the Altar. Indeed in certain quarters the height of *opprobrium* is reached when the clergy are spoken of as 'sacrificing priests.' And controversial exegesis is never so strained as in its attempt to explain in a non-natural and Protestant sense the word altar in Heb. xiii. 10. But we may surely admit at the outset, that as with the 'Real Presence' so with the 'Sacrifice.' There is a popular conception of Transubstantiation which is, as we have seen, gross and carnal, and merits all that Article XXVIII. has to say about it. So also there was, and is, a popular conception of the Sacrifice of the Mass which is seriously erroneous and derogatory to the fullness of the Atonement wrought on Calvary. But when we come to definitions, and

theological explanation this at least is clear, that the whole discussion takes place in a spiritual and mystical sphere. Transubstantiation is a spiritual and mysterious explanation of the Presence, and in the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice there is no desire on one side or the other to take away from the completeness of the one Sacrifice. The Sacrifice, on the part of those who would place the altar on a line with Calvary, is sacramental. 'It is Christ in the Sacrament Who is sacrificed, not Christ absolutely.'[1] The Sacrifice, on the part of those who would place the altar on a line with the heavenly intercession, is, as we shall see, mystical and spiritual. And it is quite possible that the whole subject is one which the human understanding cannot grasp, and human language cannot state. And it may not be the result, so to speak, of accident, but of design, that there were few, if any, efforts made in old time to state dogmatically the exact limits of this profound doctrine.

It has been pointed out that 'the efforts to formulate the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and to make a theory of it, practically date from the sixteenth century.'[2] Nevertheless it is well to endeavour to understand what is meant by it, and to clear our minds of misapprehensions on one side and on the other, which may tend to obscure a great truth, as to which it is desirable that we

[1] Bishop Hedley, *The Holy Eucharist*, p. 162.

[2] Paper read before C.B.S., 1890. Privately printed.

should rightly believe, think, and hold to our soul's health.

To the ordinary man, who does not take the trouble to inquire or think deeply, the whole conception of Sacrifice in connection with the Eucharist seems, for a member of the English Church, at all events, to be barred by the Thirty-first Article: 'The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the Sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.' We have no desire to evade the literal interpretation of the Articles, nor to apply to Article xxxi. the practical contempt which has been bestowed in some quarters upon Article viii. But a moderate acquaintance with the controversy with which the Article deals will show that so to understand it is fundamentally to misinterpret it. The Bishop of Gloucester has pointed this out succinctly and clearly in words which may well be quoted here:—

'A desperate attempt has been made in some quarters to represent it' (*i.e.* the statement in the Article) 'as a denial of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, whereas the terms in which it is drawn ought to have made it clear to every reader that this could

never have been its object . . . as a matter of fact, however, it is not even "the Sacrifice of the Mass" which is condemned, but "*the Sacrifices of Masses*" (Missarum Sacrificia), and in connection with them a current theory ("in which it was *commonly* said,") quibus vulgo dicebatur, rather than a formal statement of doctrine. What those who are responsible for the Article had before them, was the whole system of private Masses, and "the opinion" . . . "that Christ satisfied by His Passion for original sin, and instituted the Mass, in which might be made an oblation for daily sins, both mortal and venial."

'The Tridentine decrees upholding private Masses and laying down that the sacrifice of the Mass is truly propitiatory (vere propitiatorium) both for the living and the dead . . . were certainly not present to the minds of those who formulated the Article, for they were not in existence, as the subject was only considered at Trent in the autumn of 1562, nearly ten years later.'[1]

There is certainly no utterance which can be claimed as the official voice of the Church of England which denies the truth of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, but on the other hand it must be admitted that the statements in the formularies which have to do with this dogma are less explicit than those in which the truth as to the Real Presence is asserted. It must be remembered that in the times

[1] Bishop Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, vol. ii. p. 691, 692, 693.

which immediately preceded the Reformation there was a straining of the proportion of Eucharistic doctrine in favour of the Sacrifice to the neglect of the Communion. But still stamped upon the Liturgy, and in the recognised teaching of the Prayer Book, the Sacrifice retains its legitimate place. It is not a little remarkable that in answer to the question, 'Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained?'[1] the child should be taught to answer, with as yet no reference to Communion, 'For the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby.' Thus the Catechism agrees with the latest pronouncements of those who insist most strongly on this aspect, so as to say, 'Catholic faith holds that it is the Sacrifice which gives its meaning and efficacy to the common meal.'[2]

Is there then no danger to be avoided, no truth to be safeguarded with reference to this doctrine so full of mystery, and so closely bound up with that which touches the very heart's life of Christianity—the Atonement? Is the Thirty-first Article a piece of disused artillery, for which modern controversy has no use, or is there still need to combat more subtle and more seductive errors on this subject than the somewhat crude doctrines of certain writers in the later Middle Ages, which popular

[1] Church Catechism.

[2] Bishop Hedley, *The Holy Eucharist*, p. 171.

belief fastened upon, and popular error maintained, as witnessed by the statement of the Article? It is impossible to deny that if, as asserted above, the error takes place in an exalted, spiritual, and mystical plane, and although there be no wish to derogate from the unique efficacy of Christ's atoning death, the tendency of certain modern refinements is in this direction, and cannot be accepted as true to the proportion of faith.

It would seem that modern controversialists feel their freedom fettered, and their utterances tied by the necessity of accommodating themselves to those decrees of councils and other authoritative pronouncements which are *de fide* to them.

The words of the Council of Trent are as follows: 'He therefore our God and Lord, although once on the altar of the Cross, by means of death, about to offer Himself to God the Father, that He might work their eternal redemption; because, however, His priesthood was not to be extinguished by death; in the Last Supper, in the night of His betrayal, that He might leave for His beloved spouse the Church, as human nature demands, a sacrifice by which that sacrifice of blood, once to be enacted on the Cross, should be represented; and its memory might remain until the end of time, and that its saving virtue might be applied to the remission of those sins which are daily committed by us, declaring Himself to be ordained for ever a priest after the order of Melchisedek,

offered His Body and Blood under the species of Bread and Wine to God the Father, and under the symbols of the same things gave to the Apostles, whom He had made priests of the New Covenant that they should receive them, and enjoined upon them and their successors in the priesthood that they should offer, in these words, Do this as My memorial.'[1]

Hence on the one side there is the endeavour to maintain a meaning of '*representative* sacrifice,' which shall be something more than a bare commemoration, and on the other, to assert the idea of a *commemorative* sacrifice, which shall not carry with it anything which adds in the way of representation to the one Sacrifice of Calvary.

Those who maintain with the Council of Trent that the Sacrifice of the Cross and the Sacrifice of the Mass are one, in the sense that it is the same Christ Who offered Himself once in the sacrifice of blood on the altar of the Cross Who offers Himself in the unbloody sacrifice of the Mass, are accustomed to say that this representative death of Christ takes place, either in the separate consecration of the Bread and Wine, which is more than a symbolical, namely a sacramental sacrifice; or that in the Mass 'Christ by the ministry of the priest places His Body and Blood under the species of Bread and Wine, thus as it were humbling His most sacred humanity from its natural functions

[1] Sess. xxii. cap. 1.

and manner of existence to the state of food.'[1] So that to whatever extent this latter theory is received, in the words of a distinguished writer, 'In the modern development of the Eucharistic Sacrifice in the Roman Church, there has emerged again, and alas! with increasing acceptance, the conception of a re-sacrificing of Christ. Christ, it is maintained, must subject Himself anew in some real way in each Mass to the humiliation of sacrifice. There is on each occasion a fresh "self-emptying," so that each Mass shall be a fresh and substantive sacrifice distinct from, though dependent upon, the sacrifice of the Cross.'[2]

It is surely not the best way to combat what seems to be a misconception in one direction, by one equally great in another, namely, the denying of all sacrificial virtue or meaning whatever to the Holy Eucharist, and to assert that it is merely a bare symbolical representation by which to recall the human imagination to the supreme action of Calvary, with a divine sanction, it is true, but otherwise comparable to the Passion Play at Ober-Ammergau, or the rendering of Bach's Passion music at S. Paul's.

There is no doubt whatever that the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is of extreme importance,

[1] Cardinal Franzelin, quoted by Bishop Hedley, *The Holy Eucharist*, p. 167.

[2] *The Eucharistic Sacrifice.* Privately printed. See also Bishop Gore, *Roman Catholic Claims,* pp. 176, 177, note.

and is capable of being expressed in intelligible terms without in any way derogating from the unique significance of the one Offering, or resting in an unmeaning use of language, which amounts to little else than a denial of the doctrine which it is supposed to explain. The statement of Archdeacon Robert Isaac Wilberforce is none too strong when he asserts, 'It can hardly be disputed that there is no ancient writer, whose subject leads him to speak of the Holy Eucharist, who does not declare it to be a sacrifice, who does not call the place an altar at which it is offered, and the person by whom it is presented a priest.'[1]

What significance then are we to attach to this aspect of the Holy Eucharist, on what authority does it rest, and what is its practical value to the devout Communicant, apart from all controversial aspects of the question?

The first point which needs clearing is what is meant by the term 'sacrifice'?

A conception of 'sacrifice' widely prevalent in the Church of Rome is at the bottom of the doctrine alluded to above in its more ancient as well as later developments, involving the re-sacrificing of Christ in some real if mystical manner.

The following is a definition of sacrifice based on this conception: 'Sacrifice is the offering of a material thing, effected by its real or mystical

[1] Wilberforce, *The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, chap. xi. p. 319. Third Edition.

destruction by a priest, unto God, as a lawfully instituted symbol of the honour and reverence which man owes to his Creator.'[1] The point being that the destruction in some way or another of the victim is of the essence of sacrifice.

But the more usual definition of sacrifice is wider than this. It is sometimes described as 'the act of offering or presenting an oblation before Almighty God,' or 'the spontaneous expression of the homage due from the creature to the Creator;'[2] or, wider still, 'a true sacrifice is every work which is done that we may cleave to God in sacred fellowship;'[3] or, as it had come to mean among the Jews, 'something given to God in homage and recognition, or to recover His favour.'[4]

Sacrifice according to these definitions does not imply of necessity the shedding of blood. There is the example, for instance, of Melchisedek with his offering of bread and wine;[5] and under the Levitical Law there were sacrifices of flour, bread, and cakes; the essence of sacrifice being the inward disposition of devout, adoring homage and perfect surrender and dedication of the whole being to God. Had there been no sin, there would apparently have been no need for the shedding of blood; but with the appearance of sin there came in

[1] Bishop Hedley, *The Holy Eucharist*, p. 151. See on this point Bishop Gore, *The Body of Christ*, p. 178 and ff.

[2] Oxenham, *The Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement*, p. 213.

[3] S. Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, x. 6.

[4] Bishop Gore, *The Body of Christ*, p. 163.

[5] Gen. xiv. 18.

the idea of reparation or propitiation as the predominant idea, and henceforth sacrifice for sin involved the death of a living victim; and in this, perhaps, was manifested the want of faith on the part of Cain, who offered in his sacrifice the fruits of the earth, without any shedding of blood.[1]

This principle was developed in the numerous sacrifices of the Levitical Law, which in turn were gathered up in their several streams in the great Sacrifice of the Cross, and emerge quickened and spiritualised in the Sacrifice of the altar.[2]

These Jewish sacrifices may be gathered into three groups, namely, Burnt-offerings, Sin-offerings, and Peace-offerings.[3] The Holy Eucharist, as did the Sacrifice of the Cross, represents all three. In passing it may be well to note that in the Burnt-offering the victim was wholly consumed, except the skin.[4] In the Sin-offering and in the Trespass-offering the people did not partake of the sacrifice—that was reserved for the priest;[5] while the Peace-offering was partaken of by the priest and people both.

So these sacrifices, which could never take away

[1] Gen. iv. 3; *cp.* Heb. xi. 4.

[2] See on this point Bishop Gore, *The Body of Christ*, p. 165 and ff.

[3] See Luckock, *Eucharistic Sacrifice and Intercession for the Departed*, chap. iii.; also *Footprints of the Son of Man, according to S. Mark*, vol. ii. chap. lxiv. pp. 194, 195.

[4] Levit. vii. 18.

[5] Levit. vi. 26; vii. 3-6, 11; see also Levit. i. 7-17.

sin, pass into the Sacrifice of the Cross, where for the first time they receive the efficacy which they symbolised, in the setting up of the one all-sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world. Yet although the Sacrifice of the Cross is one, and offered once for all, still in a sense, real and not symbolical, it continues in the sacrifice of the altar. That this is so will be plain from the following considerations. Christ being 'the one mediator between God and man,' 'He not only merits pardon, but applies it.'[1] Christ being our High Priest, must of necessity have somewhat to offer,[2] and this is described as a perpetual sacrifice,[3] which doctrine is expressed in the frequent prayer, 'O Lamb of God, that *takest* away the sins of the world'; and is further expressed in the belief that Christ is the real Consecrator in every Eucharist in the person of those authorised to celebrate in His name; a truth which is set forth, as Mr. Keble points out, in the Church Catechism, in the answer 'Bread and Wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received,' that is to say 'that Bread and Wine over which Christ Himself hath spoken the words of institution.'[4]

[1] Wilberforce, *The Holy Eucharist*, chap. xi. p. 299. So Bishop Hedley, 'It' (*i.e.* the Sacrifice of the Eucharist) 'only applies the graces of Christ and does not originate them' (*The Holy Eucharist*, p. 159).

[2] Heb. viii. 3. [3] Heb. x. 12, *θυσίαν εἰς τὸ διηνεκές*.

[4] *Eucharistic Adoration*, chap. ii. § 46. See also Oxenham, *The Atonement*, p. 382, note.

What then is the precise point in the Sacrifice, if such language is permissible, which is reproduced on earth? Is it the moment of the Cross, or is it the reproduction, or representation, of our Lord's perpetual action in heaven? There is no doubt that in the Eucharist Christ's death is commemorated mystically, as has been already seen, by the separate consecration of the species of bread and wine. 'The mark of the Cross is on the Sacrifice, and in symbol and in mystery the Passion is commemorated and so far re-enacted,' but yet it is true to say that 'The altar is, so to speak, on a line not with Calvary, but with the Heavenly intercession.'

This will be made more clear by an examination of the Ritual of the Ancient Sacrifices, ordained by God, and which Our Lord and Saviour Himself attended, in His punctual observance of the Jewish feasts.

These ritual acts have been divided into five significant actions, each of which would seem to carry with it a typical meaning.[1]

First there was the dedication of the animal to be offered in sacrifice by the offerer at the door of the Tabernacle.[2] So Christ the perfect Victim surrendered Himself in the Eternal counsels of God.[3] Then in the second place there was the imposition of hands by the offerer, whereby he mystically

[1] The reader is referred to Luckock, *Eucharistic Sacrifice*, etc., p. 29, and to authorities there quoted.

[2] Levit. i. 3. [3] Heb. x. 7.

transferred his sins to the head of the victim, while he made an earnest confession of the sin for which he offered.[1] It is however to be noted that there was no sacrifice known to the Law which availed in itself for the remission of sins.[2] So Christ substitutes Himself to bear the sins of the whole world.[3] Then took place the slaughter of the victim at the hands of the offerer: signifying that death was the penalty of sin, and that the sinner deserved death in the Lord's Presence as a satisfaction to His holiness. So Christ died once for all[4] saying 'It is finished.'[5] Then, which is the fourth point, the priest assumes his more distinct sacerdotal functions, and takes of the blood that is shed and sprinkles it upon the brazen altar, and once a year on the great Day of Atonement on the Mercy-seat itself, within the veil.[6] So Christ presents Himself to the Father now, His sacrificial life begun, that He may plead for us. Then there followed as a fifth action the consumption of the body of the victim, either by fire, or by the priests, or by the priests and people both; so in the Feast upon the Sacrifice Christ gives us of Himself to be our spiritual food and sustenance in that Holy Sacrament.

It is to the fourth of these ritual actions that we

[1] Levit. v. 5.
[2] Willis, *Worship of the Old Covenant*, p. 144 and ff.
[3] Levit. iii. 2-13; S. John i. 29.
[4] 1 S. Peter iii. 18. [5] S. John xix. 30.
[6] Levit. i. 5; xvii. 6; xvi. 14; Heb. ix. 12; vii. 25.

must look if we would understand the significance of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and what is meant by the words quoted above, 'The altar is so to speak on a line, not with Calvary, but with the Heavenly intercession.'

The presentation of Christ's Sacrificial Blood, typified by the blood of sprinkling, began when He entered Heaven at the Ascension, and He is now able to plead continually in a reality what the High Priest did at intervals in a figure. And in accordance with this we recognise a threefold oblation in the Holy Eucharist as significant of its sacrificial character. First the offerings of Bread and Wine by the people, literally made in old times, and to this day in the Ambrosian Rite of Milan.[1] Secondly, there is the oblation of the selected elements on the Altar: 'And when there is a Communion, the Priest shall then place upon the Table so much Bread and Wine, as he shall think sufficient.'[2] And then, thirdly, there is the oblation of these same elements after their consecration, which is the true sacrificial element of the rite. And so we pray, 'O Lord and Heavenly Father, we Thy humble servants entirely desire Thy Fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.'[3] As to which

[1] Compare Rubric of Holy Communion Service, 'The Bread and Wine for the Communion shall be provided by the Curate and the Churchwarden at the charges of the parish.'

[2] Prayer Book, Rubric, Holy Communion.

[3] Prayer of Oblation, Holy Communion.

words it is to be noted that they are not to be pressed so as to water down the term Sacrifice into a word of poetical symbolism significant of ordinary praise and thanksgiving, but it is to be remembered that this phrase occurs practically in the Canon of the Roman Mass, viz.: *hoc sacrificium Laudis*; and Benedict XIV. said in so many words *sacrificium Missæ latreuticum est et Eucharisticum, id est, sacrificium laudis et gratiarum actionis pro acceptis beneficiis.*[1]

The chief difficulty will be felt to lie as to the connection between the mystic pleading in heaven by our Blessed Lord of His precious blood-shedding, which few will care to deny, and the service of the Holy Communion as celebrated here at our altars. As to this it may perhaps be permitted at this point to quote the following able and lucid statement: 'I know of no finer expression of this type of the interpretation of the Eucharistic Sacrifice than the exposition of this passage by an early mediæval writer, Paschasius Radbert. According to his representation, the Church on earth offers its gifts and devotions through the hands of its organ, the earthly priest; and so far it can be called the sacrifice of the priest or of the Church. But then in consecration, by the Word and Holy Spirit, it passes out of our hands, and is translated into heavenly places, is borne on to the heavenly altar,

[1] Benedict XIV. *de Missæ Sacrificio*, lib. ii. cap. xiii. § 16, quoted by Father Puller, *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, No. 9, p. 413.

which is the Body of Christ, Who as our High Priest ministers it before the throne of the Father, and identifies it with His own "immolation" of Himself, so that in it (through the double consecration) "spiritually, not carnally," "in mystery not in fact"—for "He dieth no more"—His self-immolation is reproduced and commemorated, and so He gives it back to us as His Body and Blood in its new power and significance.'[1] And this is the underlying significance of the declaration on the Eucharistic Sacrifice made by certain representative clergy in the year 1867, part of which, as bearing on the Real Presence, has been already quoted above. It runs as follows:—

'We repudiate the notion of any fresh Sacrifice, or any view of the Eucharistic Sacrificial offering as of something apart from the One All-sufficient Sacrifice and Oblation on the Cross, which alone "is that perfect Redemption, Propitiation, and Satisfaction, for all the Sins of the whole world, both original and actual," and Which Alone is "meritorious."

'We believe that, as in Heaven, Christ, our Great High Priest, ever offers Himself before the Eternal Father, pleading by His Presence His Sacrifice of Himself once offered on the Cross; so on Earth, in the Holy Eucharist, that same Body, once for all sacrificed for us, and that same Blood, once for all

[1] A paper on the Eucharistic Sacrifice, privately printed. See also Bishop Gore, *The Body of Christ*, p. 186 and ff.

shed for us, Sacramentally Present, are offered and pleaded before the Father by the Priest, as our Lord ordained to be done in Remembrance of Himself, when He instituted the Blessed Sacrament of His Body and Blood.'[1]

It is necessary now to ask, To what direct authority of Holy Scripture and of antiquity can this interpretation appeal?

The Epistle to the Hebrews presupposes this doctrine of the Eternal Priesthood, and the efficacy of the Blood of Sprinkling, such as has been described above.[2] Taking isolated passages, there are two which are much relied on, namely, S. Luke xxii. 19, and 1 Cor. xi. 26. As to the first, *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν Ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.* It is obvious that this may mean, and it has been taken to mean, only, do this action that you may be reminded of Me. It may be said to mean this, but surely it also must be taken to mean a great deal more. It has been contended with great learning that both *ποιεῖν* and *ἀνάμνησις* are sacrificial terms, and even such a cautious writer as Bishop Wordsworth of Lincoln, while he denies the sense suggested to *ποιεῖν*, would yet give a fuller sense to *ἀνάμνησις*, 'Do this for My commemoration.' The whole subject of the sacrificial use of the word *ποιεῖν* in the Septuagint is gone into at great length in a

[1] See pp. 83, 84. The whole declaration will be found in a volume of this series, Bodington, *Books of Devotion*, p. 304.

[2] See Bishop Gore, *The Body of Christ*, p. 250 and ff.

note appended to Bishop Hamilton's charge (1867), which tradition assigns to one of his well-known chaplains.

But this interpretation of the word, it is fair to say, is received with little favour at the present day as being only scantily recognised in the early Church, as far as we know from its literature.

As regards *ἀνάμνησις*, in Heb. x. 3, the only place in the New Testament where, apart from the passages illustrating the Holy Eucharist, the word is used, we are told that the offering of the blood is to make *ἀνάμνησις* of sins year by year. It would seem to mean the offering of a *μνημόσυνον*, which is the regular sacrificial term for a religious offering to God.

The point however which most concerns us, if this interpretation be granted, is this: How can God, Who never slumbers nor sleeps, and Who holds in His hands the destinies of nations as well as the life of the smallest child, Who feeds the ravens and clothes the lilies—how can He need that His memory should be quickened by anything that we men can say or do?

It would be found on examination that this doctrine reposes, as do God's dealings with men generally, on His respect for our freewill, and on His demand for our co-operation as the basis of benefits conferred. But, however this may be, we find that He Himself has ordained on other occasions a similar *μνημόσυνον*. It was so

with the Rainbow: 'I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth.'[1] So, again, 'circumcision was the sign and token of the covenant with Abraham, and the blood of sacrifice was the great instrument of the Mosaic covenant, the sign not only to man but to God, the remembrance of its benefits and obligations to both parties of the covenant.'[2] So once more the sounding of the trumpets 'ἔσται ὑμῖν ἀνάμνησις ἔναντι τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν.'[3] So again we read of the shewbread, 'καὶ ἔσονται οἱ ἄρτοι εἰς ἀνάμνησιν προκείμενοι τῷ κυρίῳ.'[4] And so Bishop Harold Browne has said, Christ instituted 'not only a remembrance [of the sacrifice] to ourselves, but it was also esteemed a special mode of pleading it before God, and therefore it was named a sacrifice. And as the sacrifice of the Cross was the propitiatory sacrifice, so this too was called a sacrifice of propitiation, both because of its recalling that great propitiatory sacrifice, and because by enabling us spiritually to feed on, and to take the blessed food of that sacrifice to ourselves, it was the means of bringing home to our souls the pardoning efficacy of Christ's death, the propitiation for sins which He has wrought.'[5]

As regards the second passage (ὁσάκις γὰρ ἐὰν

[1] Gen. ix. 16.
[2] Bishop Hamilton, *Charge*, p. 52.
[3] Num. x. 10.
[4] Levit. xxiv. 7.
[5] Bishop Harold Browne on Article XXXI., p. 743.

ἐσθίητε τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον, καὶ τὸ ποτήριον πίνητε, τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου καταγγέλλετε ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθῃ),[1] the meaning would seem to be, you proclaim as heralds, as the priests blew with trumpets for a memorial *before God*, on the Feast of Trumpets; you exhibit before God and man the memorials of Christ's death, until at the end of the world He comes out of the Holy of Holies having finished His sacrificial pleading. As to the testimony of the ancient Church on this point, the statement of Archdeacon Wilberforce quoted above (p. 151) is emphatic, and a catena of authorities will be found in his admirable treatise, as also in the writings of Dr. Pusey. It will be sufficient here to recall the use of such words in connection with the Holy Eucharist as the following, προσφορὰ, θυσία, ἱερουργία, *oblatio*, *sacrificium Dominicum* in primitive times, and also the well-known words of the Canon of the Council of Nicæa—'It hath come before the holy and great Synod, that in certain places and cities the Deacons give the Eucharist to the Presbyters, which neither the canon nor usage has handed down, that those who have no power to offer should give to those who offer the Body of Christ.'[2] Tables of statements made by English divines, who allow themselves to use similar language, however much they may have qualified it elsewhere, will be found in the notes to the above-quoted charge of Bishop Hamilton, and in Scuda-

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 26.

[2] *Council of Nic.*, Can. 18.

more's *Notitia Eucharistica.* There is one notable English divine, however, who is commonly quoted as being opposed to the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Hooker in his great work makes the following statement: 'Sacrifice is now no part of the Church's Ministry'; or once more: 'The Fathers of the Church of Christ call usually the ministry of the Gospel *priesthood* in regard of that which the Gospel hath *proportionable* to ancient sacrifices, namely, the Communion of the Blessed Body and Blood of Christ, although it have properly now no sacrifice.'[1] As to which Mr. Keble says: 'This passage undoubtedly does *in words* contradict the saying that the Eucharist is "the Christian sacrifice"; but, on second thoughts, it may perhaps be found substantially to assert the doctrine contained in that saying. . . . It is the one great reality summing up in itself all the memorial sacrifices of old. In the Christian scheme it is "proportionable" to them; and of course it stands in the same rank and relation to them, as the other antitypes in the Gospel to their several types and shadows in the Law. The memorial therefore made of Christ before the Father in Holy Communion is as much more real, more glorious, more blessed, than all the memorial sacrifices of old; than the yearly Paschal Lamb for instance—as the one atoning sacrifice of the Cross surpassed the Lamb slain at the first Passover. . . . He who thinks most highly, and therefore least

[1] Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.*, v. 78, § 2.

inadequately of that holy and divine Sacrament cannot well say, or conceive, anything of it higher than this—that it is, in the strict sense of the word, "that which the Gospel hath *proportionable* to ancient sacrifices." Therefore let no person apprehend that in teaching and magnifying the Eucharistic Sacrifice he is really contradicting this great authority: any more than, to name a kindred point, he need think himself departing *in principle* from Hooker's mind by maintaining the Real objective Presence after Consecration.'[1]

It is not a little remarkable that the ancient prophets, when speaking of the worship which the Messiah would inaugurate, speak of that worship in sacrificial terms. So we read, 'From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same My Name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto My Name, and a pure offering.'[2] Or again, 'In those days, and at that time, will I cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David; . . . For thus saith the Lord; David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel; neither shall the priests the Levites want a man before Me to offer burnt-offerings, and to kindle meat-offerings, and to do sacrifice continually.'[3] Once more, 'And He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and He shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as

[1] Mr. Keble, *Eucharistic Adoration*, pp. 69, 70, 71.
[2] Mal. i. 11. [3] Jer. xxxiii. 15, 17, 18.

gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness. Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the Lord, as in the days of old, and as in former years.'[1] So also Ezekiel's vision of the Temple, City, and Holy Land in its spiritual significance.[2]

There is no desire to press any of these mysterious prophecies beyond what they will bear, but it is fair to say that the Catholic Church feels itself at home when reading such language, can apply it without difficulty, and understand it without artificial forcing as being such language as prophecy might be expected to use in view of the fulfilment now realised in the sacrificial worship of the Church. It may be well to conclude this review of this profound mystery with the following words extracted from the thoughtful estimate of Dr. Milligan: 'The worship of the Christian Church is thus again no mere independent arrangement provided by the goodness of God to guide us to communion with Him. It is no mere token of His love which might have been replaced by another equally precious and effective. It flows from communion with the Father through the Son as an already existing reality, and it is because it flows from that communion that it leads us to it. Hence it is that from the very beginning of her history the Church has instinctively regarded the Sacrament of Holy Communion as the central act of her worship. . . .

[1] Mal. iii. 3, 4.

[2] Ezek. xl., xlviii.

It was not on superstitious grounds, but as the most perfect expression by the members of the Body upon earth of the attitude in Heaven of Him in Whom they lived, that the Eucharist became the keynote of Christian worship.'[1]

We have tried to suggest that the very mystery of such a subject as the Eucharistic Sacrifice and the evident desire on all sides to do nothing which would derogate from the supreme efficacy of the atoning Sacrifice of Calvary, however much words and theories and logic may tend in the contrary direction, should exempt it from the controversial bitterness which has fastened upon it. And inasmuch as few things are more barren than mere theological orthodoxy divorced from its consequents, it may not be amiss to hint at one or two spiritual deductions which flow from the right apprehension of the full meaning of the Christian Sacrifice.

In the first place, if it be true, as Dr. Milligan has said in the passage just quoted, that here in the Holy Eucharist we have the characteristic service of the Church, and that in this more than in any other way we are united to the Eucharist of Heaven, it would seem that herein is the justification of that desire to make the Holy Eucharist form the principal part of every service where this is possible, certainly never to allow a Sunday, the day of the Lord, or any festival of obligation, to pass without

[1] Milligan, *The Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood*, pp. 309, 310, 311.

its Eucharist, and if possible to make this once more the daily Sacrifice of the Church. That a daily Eucharist is contemplated is plain from the following directions in the Prayer Book: 'Note also, that the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel appointed for the Sunday shall serve all the week after, where it is not in this Book otherwise ordered.'[1] Again, 'the same Collect, Epistle, and Gospel shall serve for every day after unto the Epiphany.'[2] The proper Prefaces in the Communion Service are to be said, with one exception, on the festival appointed 'and seven' (or 'six') 'days after.' And in the Rubrics at the end of the Communion Office we read: 'And in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, and Colleges, where there are many Priests and Deacons, they shall all receive the Communion with the Priest every Sunday at the least, except they have a reasonable cause to the contrary.'[3] There is of course, however, the danger here too of orthodoxy outrunning devotion, and it would be a great calamity if the daily Eucharist were revived merely as a concession to a passing wave of opinion, rather than as the impulse which cannot be restrained of the Church longing to assert her rights. The Daily Sacrifice of the Eucharist must rest on a great deal more than immemorial custom, or the

[1] Prayer Book, 'The Order how the rest of Holy Scripture is appointed to be read.'

[2] Rubric appended to the Circumcision.

[3] For the history of the Daily Eucharist, see Wilberforce, chap. xiii.; Scudamore, pp. 929-938.

tacit assent of the Prayer Book; it must be founded deep down in the devotional heart of the Church.

If as a matter of theory the Christian believes that the Sacrifice of the altar contains the spiritual substance of the Jewish type and shadow, then he must bring to it all the spiritual realities appropriate to that belief. It is to him the one great burnt-offering which typifies complete dedication and surrender, together with the exhibition of the exhaustion of God's wrath against sin: and therefore he who pleads this Sacrifice must himself know something of that detachment which belongs to him who wishes to know nothing save Christ crucified. There must be in him a freedom from sin, that is from all association with sin of whatever sort it be; there must be in him a striving after that absolute devotion which desires nothing else than to be consumed with the fire of Divine Love. As he priest who offers the Sacrifice puts upon him the vestments which shall remind him at every moment that one who is to be counted worthy of such a privilege must have learned what it is to put on Christ, so there must be a constant struggle to put aside an easy formality, which can become too readily associated with the mere assisting at the Church's offering with little else but bodily service. There can be no shifting of the responsibility which enjoins the worship of the whole being on to any form or rite or obligation, however punctually performed. Men of sacrifice must plead the Sacrifice,

and the whole burnt-offering of the Christian covenant must be offered by those who are wholly dedicated to God.

Once more, if we think of the Sin-offering in connection with the Sacrifice of the altar, the dominant note is that of intercession, in which, especially on the great Day of Atonement, the High Priest pleaded for the sins of God's people Israel, for himself, and for all associated with him. The whole question of intercession, as we have already seen, is a difficult one. We may well ask how it is possible for any human being to come between God and the ordered working out of certain causes and effects, simply because we ask Him. The lightning flash which is about to strike the ridge of a lofty building may be diverted from its course by a metal rod, simply because it is the better conductor of the two. If such a homely illustration be permissible, is our prayer which we offer when we intercede, is the life which we interpose when we so stand before God, of a greater power with Him, so as to divert His purpose along this channel rather than that, in carrying out His supreme will, simply because we ask Him? The Holy Eucharist surely meets us when we thus recognise our impotence; and just as Abraham saw the ram in the thicket caught by his horns which he offered instead of his son, so we feel that we can plead the perfect merits of the perfect Man, where our own fail so miserably, and are weighed in the balance and are found wanting; and

so we plead the one sin-offering for all the world, for the Church, for sinners, for ourselves, for our manifold needs, for our sins and shortcomings, and feel that every prayer is reminiscent of this and linked on to it, when we say 'through Jesus Christ our Lord.' Tertullian deprecates violence as shown by the Roman emperors towards the Christians on the ground that so to persecute and destroy them was a short-sighted policy, because their prayers for the emperors, for the Roman state and people, for the continuance of the empire, were such as an emperor might well desire.[1] This shows a belief in the value of intercession which puts our use of it to shame. There is a greater recognition of it at the present day as a duty; heads for intercession, and requests for prayer are multiplied. But the arrows are but little use without the hand of the giant, or in the hand of the children of Judah, who have not been taught the use of the bow.[2] The Sin-offering of the altar seems to give an occupation to those who grieve and fret because they seem to be swept on one side by the rushing stream of what is known as church activity. Here is a piece of work which the old men, women and children can do, in manning the walls, while their active warriors have gone out to fight. Here is a work for the priest to do, whose body now refuses its ready co-operation in the active desires

[1] Tertullian, *Apol.* 30-32.

[2] Cf. Psalm cxxvii. 5, and 2 Sam. i. 18.

of his heart; and he is astonished to find that while he pleads at the altar, he also is 'bringing forth more fruit in his age,'[1] and that one day in God's courts is better than a thousand.

Most conspicuously after all these stands forth the symbolism of the Peace-offering. 'He is our Peace.'[2] 'The peace-offering had for its object communion always with God, sometimes also with one's fellows, as at the Passover.'[3] It may be in the exigencies of life that we think more of the Burnt-offering and the Sin-offering than we do of the Peace-offering. We seldom forget to beg; the Elder Son is not so grateful for his constant unintermitted blessings as the Prodigal is for those which have been restored to him. The Holy Eucharist is after all pre-eminently 'our Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.' 'It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks.' 'The Eucharist' remains the characteristic, perhaps the Scriptural, name for this holy rite. 'We give thanks to Thee for Thy great glory' is the altar-song which is most eloquent of our joy. The Peace-offering is that which the soul can offer which is at peace with God. Peace, contentment, joy, these are some of the fruits of the Tree of Life, which grows on either side of the river, whose fruit is for meat, and whose very leaf is medicine.[4]

[1] Psalm xcii. 13;
[2] Ephes. ii. 14.
[3] Luckock, *Eucharistic Sacrifice*, p. 28.
[4] Ezek. xlvii. 12.

CHAPTER VIII

THE LORD'S TABLE

'Et constituit eis Rex annonam per singulos dies de cibis Suis et de vino, unde bibebat Ipse, ut enutriti tribus annis, postea starent in conspectu Regis.'

THERE is really no antagonism between the terms Table and Altar. The Jews, as to whose sacrificial system there is no doubt, used both terms. So we read in Ezekiel, 'The altar of wood was three cubits high, and the length thereof two cubits . . . and he said unto me, This is the table that is before the Lord';[1] or again, 'They shall enter into My sanctuary, and they shall come near to My table';[2] or once more, in Malachi, 'Ye offer polluted bread upon Mine altar; and ye say, Wherein have we polluted Thee? In that ye say, The table of the Lord is contemptible.'[3] The word Table again is of frequent use in the Churches of the East, as to whose Eucharistic doctrine there is no doubt, and the common liturgical term for the altar is *τράπεζα ἅγια*. It is well to notice, however, that there is

[1] Ezek. xli. 22. [2] Ezek. xliv. 16.
[3] Mal. i. 7-12. See Luckock, *Divine Liturgy*, pp. 49-50.

no such term in the Prayer Book as Communion-Table, inasmuch as the Table is viewed as the Table of the Lord, and not of the Communicants. Table and Altar are both terms which may be legitimately used, the one referring to the Communion, the other to the Sacrificial aspect of this great rite. Having therefore considered at some length the Eucharistic Sacrifice, it will be necessary to consider also the great truth which underlies the Scriptural expression, 'The Lord's table.'[1]

If we examine the underlying conception of the word table, we shall find that it conveys to us as its most prominent meaning the idea of food. 'Christ in the Sacrament imparteth Himself, even His whole Person, as a mystical Head unto every soul that receiveth Him. . . . What merit, force or virtue soever there is in His Sacrificial Body and Blood we freely, fully and wholly have it by this Sacrament.'[2] Or in the words of the Prayer Book, God 'hath given His Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance in that Holy Sacrament.'

Stress has been laid above[3] on this aspect of the Holy Sacrament as of vital need for the young, the tempted, and the struggling as they pass through the wilderness of the world on their way to the promised land. It is, humanly speaking, impossible in the midst of the powerful and spiritual foes which

[1] 1 Cor. x. 21. [2] Hooker, *Eccles. Pol.*, v. lxvii. 7.
[3] Chap. iv.

are banded against us, a hostile world, and a weak and craving flesh, to pass unscathed if we neglect the spiritual strength which Christ has willed to impart to us in His life-giving Sacrament. But it is necessary to develop this a little further. Life after all is not always and to everybody a monotonous struggle against ever-present evil. The Saintly Life is the separated life, the consecrated life; and this separation is twofold, separated *from* evil or anything that is short of the highest which is known as detachment, and separation *to* God and Holy things, which is known as attachment. It is here that we see the Lord's Table in its most characteristic function as ministering the Food of Saints, 'the corn of the elect and the wine that blossometh into virgins.'[1]

It is the food given us 'that ye may grow thereby: if so be ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious.'[2] We are perhaps slow to realise that the life of goodness is difficult of attainment, subject to fluctuations and disappointments, liable to failure and accident, that the same food which enabled us to grow out of the liability to those more serious moral evils in life, which meant death to the soul and higher aspirations, is still needed for the attainment and development of the greater virtues, and the refinements of saintliness. A man of high moral rectitude and benevolence, strict, upright, and just, is a grand development. Viewed

[1] Zech. ix. 17, Vulgate. [2] 1 S. Peter ii. 2-3.

in comparison with the profligate and sinful, we are tempted to think that there is nothing higher. It is only when we compare him with the saintly type, such as is set before us in the New Testament, and experimentally in the lives of the Saints, that we realise that there is something nobler; that he is undeveloped, that there are certain powers and capacities loosely labelled as 'the spirit' which he never uses at all. They are indeed unattainable by man left to himself, and it is here that we are brought back to the power and virtue of spiritual gifts, of which the Holy Eucharist is the supreme example, as it stands forth as the food of the Saints, the bread by which alone the highest life is possible.

It must be clearly understood at the outset that the good life, the highest life, is hard, and difficult of attainment. Aristotle said even of moral excellence, *ἔργον ἐστὶ σπουδαῖον εἶναι*;[1] and to attain to that perfection which God designed for us that 'we should be a kind of first-fruits of His creatures'[2] is harder still.

The sacramental life has been described as 'the extension of the Incarnation.' This on the side of God would express His purpose to dwell with us and be in us; but on the side of man it also expresses a capacity to work together with God, to be conscious of His presence, receptive of His influence, and obedient to His will. And as this knowledge

[1] *Nic. Eth.*, 2, ix. 2. [2] S. James i. 18.

and apprehension of God is fundamental to the spiritual life, so it presents an ever-present difficulty, which not even growth in holiness will render attainable without an effort. Hence there is always a tendency to repose in something short of the unseen, to rest in a rite, or in the presence of an image, or in the punctual performance of some duty of routine. The Blessed Sacrament itself has become materialised. It is this that gives point to the strange accusation of adoring the Elements in those who through spiritual indolence seem unable to rise from the mode of the Presence to the Presence itself. While short of this there would seem to be a tendency to shrink back in fatigue from the realisation of the Presence of God, without the constant aid of the Sacramental Presence, at all times and for all purposes, as to which we have after all no guarantee that it was vouchsafed to us for any other purpose than the offering of the Eucharist and the feeding of the faithful with the sacred Body and Blood.[1]

The Spiritual Life must of necessity be a life spent as far as possible in the Presence of God, and this, as has been said, is, and always must be, difficult. It sounds like a commonplace to say, that nothing of the kind is possible without faith, and yet this is absolutely true, 'without faith it is impossible to please Him: for he that cometh to

[1] See Bishop Gore, *The Body of the Lord*, Preface to Fourth Edition, p. viii.

God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him.'[1]

It will be sufficient for the present purpose to describe faith as the power of realising the unseen, of seeing and talking with God. So Gabriel as he wings his way to Jerusalem delivers to Zacharias as his credentials the stupendous announcement, 'I am Gabriel, that stand in the presence of God.'[2] So prophets like Elijah would say, 'As the Lord of hosts liveth, before Whom I stand.'[3] So we read of old, 'And the Lord spake unto Moses face to face.'[4] And when we have grasped this conception, then we begin to realise that the very thing which makes faith so unpopular with a proud and self-sufficient world constitutes in reality its great value for the purpose for which we need it. A belief, for instance, in a Sacramental Presence which defies all human calculations, and surpasses all intellectual appreciation, lifts us at once into that element where we float or sink. The very loss of all human support and solid ground makes us stretch out our hands unto God, and use those spiritual capacities which were dying of atrophy. In vain the cautious inquirer puts forth a timid foot, resolutely refusing to stir the other from the solid ground of intellectual apprehension. With him it is *intelligo ut credam*, not *credo ut intelligam*. And there he remains feeling out for

[1] Heb. xi. 6.
[2] S. Luke i. 19.
[3] 1 Kings xviii. 15.
[4] Exod. xxxiii. 11.

some solid stone based on intellectual certainty; but he has come to a stream which may not thus be forded, 'a river that I could not pass over: . . . waters to swim in, a river that could not be passed over.'[1] At the very outset we have, as given us by Christ in the Sacramental Mystery, an invitation to come to Him on the water; to look at the waves growing boisterous in the wind will make us sink, to reach out to Him will be to feel His hand, not only to steady us in the immediate difficulty, but to give us that capacity for realising the unseen, which is the passage from mere moral excellence, grand as it is, to Saintliness, which is the fullness of our heritage.

We are therefore not likely to do much in the spiritual life unless we follow on this guidance which bids us develop the instruments of faith. We therefore do not welcome the well-meant efforts of those who try to make faith easier. The more we are tried the better we feel that it is for us. The tourist who is carried up to the summit of some mountain by tunnels and lifts will never know the joy of the mountaineer, and the delight of achievement. He may or may not catch a moment's glimpse of the view, and feel the keenness of the blast and the sense of elevation, but he is a stranger to the joy which the other has made his own, who has besides attained, which the other has not, the capacity for greater achievements. 'Lord, increase

[1] Ezek. xlvii. 5.

our faith'[1] is, after all, a better request than 'Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us.'[2]

And yet it is impossible to overestimate the difficulty of thus grasping the unseen. Even Apostles, as we have seen, were asleep, weighed down with weariness when God's glory passed before them at the Transfiguration.[3] Once more they were asleep when the mystery of the Atonement was beginning to be enacted in Gethsemane.[4] There is mountain sickness and mountain depression which overtakes the traveller. And hence it is that we need strength, such strength as the Table of the Lord supplies, in our efforts to reach out to Him, to talk to Him and be with Him, which is of the very essence of saintliness.

'Our Father Which art in heaven.' See how our simplest prayer carries us up there. All our devotions are like wicket gates which open into the paths where we can mount up and find God. The painter sees the shimmer of His robe, Who decks Himself with light as it were with a garment; the poet traces His way in the sea, His path in the great waters; but it is for the Saint to find Him. And the quest is a difficult one, needing spiritual faculties; it is an engrossing one, needing spiritual endurance. And hence the Saint of the Lord naturally turns to His Table, where there is the Food provided for him, while he hears a voice

[1] S. Luke xvii. 5.
[2] S. John xiv. 8.
[3] S. Luke ix. 32.
[4] S. Luke xxii. 45.

saying, 'Arise and eat; because the journey is too great for thee.'[1] For the eye of faith may get dim, the understanding may flag, as distractions burst in upon his prayers, and the daily life strives to assert itself, and that which should have been his refreshment is broken with dreams of toil as in the sleep of a tired worker. While the affections may become blunted, and He Who is out of sight at last becomes also out of mind.

And not only in devotion, but also in daily work, the difficulty of the Saintly Life becomes apparent. A man may gather himself up for the great duties of life; they are done on the stage of that theatre which is represented by his friends and companions, and his reputation depends on it. But the valet gives up the attempt to write the biography of one whose life, when off the stage, is at least unheroic, it may be unedifying. It was no light thing which the Apostle enjoined when he said, 'Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God.'[2] He who would lead the Saintly Life must feel that there are no such things as uneventful days and irresponsible hours. They are of those who in the well-known words, 'have lived peacefully hidden lives, and rest in unvisited tombs.'

The majority of men, after all, have to trade with the one talent day by day, and there are few who resist the temptation to bury it. Martha's

[1] 1 Kings xix. 7. [2] 1 Cor. x. 31.

work is necessary and very engrossing, and Mary's action seems, viewed from the point of view of Martha, to be irritatingly wrong. And yet God, as we know, is always coming to those quiet lives spent in uneventful surroundings to take thence His messengers and servants. David the youngest is taken away from the sheepfolds to be king. The ignorant fishermen are taken from their nets to be Princes of the Church. A tradesman of the most despised trade, a dweller in the desert, oppressed slaves, are all taken out of themselves in a process which defies the wisdom of the world. And if this be so, how much waste of good material there must be in those who have not had strength to develop themselves according to God's will concerning them.

Neither are those virtues which characterise the Saintly Life so easy of achievement as men suppose. If we take, for instance, those which are described as 'the fruit of the Spirit,' they seem to be very simple as we read through the list, and some of them suffer so much from their counterfeits as hardly to appear virtues at all. And yet 'love,' which is not an irritating *complaisance*, is by no means easy of attainment, and where it is not sincere certainly expects an equivalent for outlay which soon betrays itself as selfishness in masquerade. 'Joy' which is not mere light-heartedness, and 'peace' which is not mere insensibility to environment, are by no means common forms of

virtue nor popular when they are discovered. 'Longsuffering' is apt to get trampled on as cowardice, and 'gentleness' to be scouted as affectation. 'Goodness' is referred to the Charity Organisation Society, and 'Faith' to an undenominational eclecticism. 'Meekness' is the sport of novelists, and 'temperance' suffers from fanaticism. How little does the life of the average man tend to bear fruit in this direction. And how poor and how forced do these virtues seem even in those who are striving after holiness. Truly here once more ἔργον ἔστι σπουδαῖον εἶναι. And fruit such as this we realise can be produced by no human forcing, but must be the steady, even growth brought forth by grace, such as that which is the supreme characteristic of the Food supplied at the Lord's Table.

Neither must it be inferred from what was said above that the saint of God can ever feel himself absolutely secure from the assaults of those sins the temptations to which he believes himself long ago to have left behind.

> 'The grey-hair'd saint may fail at last,
> The surest guide a wanderer prove;
> Death only binds us fast
> To the bright shore of love.'[1]

It is one of the peculiar trials which seem to interfere in so many cases with the peace of God which passeth all understanding, that evil forms out of the

[1] *Christian Year*, Eighth Sunday after Trinity.

past come back and demand admission to the place where they once were welcomed. Or evil imaginations and strange suggestions come wafted in on the breeze even through the window which is open towards Jerusalem. This indeed would seem to be one of Satan's last efforts of malignity, where he has failed to allure from the side of Christ, to poison the air with the miasma which floats over the evil doings of men.

The message of the Gospel is joy, and joy should be the characteristic attribute of holiness, but many are going heavily because of scruples which make them think that all that they do is wrong; or because of evil imaginations and mocking voices which they fail to realise as being external, and neither welcomed nor accepted so as to form a sin. Certainly the temptations of good people are very real, and their faults may easily become serious defects and blemishes, without the help of God. And so through His Sacramental Food Christ comes to them, He already begins that which He will perfect hereafter, when He clothes with His own merits our most imperfect efforts. Already through His Sacrament He begins to bestow those gifts which He Himself will hereafter recognise and crown. Natural kindliness becomes supernatural love; natural innocency becomes supernatural purity; natural forbearance becomes supernatural longsuffering; and easiness becomes peace, and tenderness gentleness; while

the troublesome thoughts cast themselves out in gentle ripples against the barrier of temperance which they may not pass, and of holiness which they may not sully. The morality of Christianity has clinging to it the supernatural glow of sacramental grace, which makes the clear and obvious distinction between a moral man and a saint.

But another conception still underlies this expression, 'the Lord's Table.' It is not merely the supply of food which satisfies the bare requirements of the soul, it is also the Feast which appears so often in the New Testament as symbolical of God's favour and grace. A certain man in the parable makes a great feast to which he bids many. Now it is a certain king who makes a marriage for his son. Now it is the blessing pronounced on those who are called to the Marriage Supper of the Lamb.[1] There is a refinement of blessing in all these similitudes, comparable it may be to joy as contrasted with happiness and glory as contrasted with beauty; a similitude which makes us wonder until we remember that it is with food as with everything else that God gives; He attends not only to what He gives, but to the way in which He gives it. We may therefore perhaps not do wrong in thinking of the Table of the Lord as the table of a feast, replenished, that is, with luxuries of blessing, with refinements of spiritual food to be found nowhere else in such richness and profusion.

[1] S. Luke xiv. 16; S. Matt. xxii. 2; Rev. xix. 9.

The Feasts of the Church which we find it so hard to enter into and enjoy may owe much of their glory to this feast, which forms their chief feature, as we say in the familiar hymn:

'Hail, sacred Feast, which Jesus makes,
Rich banquet of His Flesh and Blood!
Thrice happy he who here partakes
That sacred stream, that heavenly food.

Why are its dainties all in vain
Before unwilling hearts display'd?
Was not for you the Victim slain?
Are you forbid the children's bread?'

Here accordingly we find an anticipation of that promise, 'Many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven.'[1] In this holy feast we are united to that great company who in all Christian times and in all Christian places have been called to the Marriage Supper of the Lamb. Christ calls from His altar, 'Gather My saints together unto Me: those that have made a covenant with Me with sacrifice.'[2] We feel that this is the time of our greatest earthly privilege; we are placing ourselves quite near His throne. We are sitting down at the same table from which saints and martyrs in all ages have drawn their strength. It is the same banquet of which they have spoken so lovingly, the same awful mystery knitting us all together in one.

It may be that in fear of error we have thought

[1] S. Matt. viii. 11. [2] Psalm 4, 5.

too little of the 'Communion of Saints.' The scant recognition of the dead has been a distinct loss to us, the imperfect recognition of the Saints may be a greater loss still. 'Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness,'[1] says our Blessed Lord; but where? Not among the children of this world, where the Unjust Steward so cleverly ingratiated himself, but among those who belong to the generation of the children of light. 'I will praise Thee,' says the Psalmist, 'among much people.'[2] 'Ye are come,' we read, 'unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels. To the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven.'[3] The invited guest has certainly some thoughts to spare on those who are invited to share the feast with him; and we cannot but feel that, if we shut ourselves out by wilful sin, or by careless neglect, we are thus preparing for ourselves a foretaste of the dreadful shutting out hereafter. While if we draw nigh it is to the blessing of the Redeemed, to sit down with those who in all ages have been called the friends of God: the glorious company of the apostles, the goodly fellowship of the prophets, the noble army of martyrs; in the one communion and fellowship of the mystical Body of Christ.

And even more may we think of this as a feast,

[1] S. Luke xvi. 9. [2] Ps. xxxv. 18. [3] Heb. xii. 22, 23.

because in it we realise a perfect satisfaction. Our whole being responds to the prodigal bounty of God. The body feels that, made clean by the precious Body, it may now be the trusted friend, instead of 'the nearest camp to the enemy.' The hungry mind is satisfied with the vision of Eternal Truth, the hungry spirit is satisfied with Christ Himself. And so it is found to be the highest joy in the satisfaction of the whole man, in him who having cried 'My soul is athirst for God,' has found Him, and is found of Him in perfect sacramental union. And so there comes from it that perfect rest in the realisation of God, as of the soul which reposes in His Presence. It is as when Jesus woke in the storm on the Lake, amidst the tossing billows, or when He stood by the tomb of Lazarus surrounded by the cries of grief of those who were powerless to arrest death. With Him we are able to approach life from above, with Him we feel that we are directed by a master mind, we can approach life's troubles in the confidence of a great strength. We carry Christ, and although the surface water may be lashed by the storm, deep down there is the unruffled calm of the soul that is in conscious union with God, with Him Who is our hope and strength, a very present help in trouble.

But above all, this Table supplies to us the food of immortality. 'If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever.' One thing after another seems to fall away from us, as we move towards the grave,

of those things in correspondence with which, what we call life really consists. But there ought to be growing within us a life within a life which will not die. We ought to be able to realise the conception of the Apostle, 'Nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.'[1] When the prophet of old restored the dead child to life, we read how he lay upon the child, putting his mouth upon his mouth, and his eyes upon his eyes, and his hands upon his hands, and how he stretched himself upon the child until life came back into him.[2] So Christ adapts Himself in His Sacrament to our mortality to impart to it a fresh and abiding life. He bends over humanity dead in trespasses and sins. The staff of the prophet has been laid in vain upon the pale cold face of the child. The Law, great as it was, could never give life. And Christ comes in His infinite condescension, and adapts Himself to our poor human nature: the Saviour to him who needs salvation, the living to the dead, the great to the little, the glorious body to the body of our humiliation.

So it has been since the day of our first Communion. He bent Himself down to our childish needs, He fastened on our growing manhood to rescue it from evil, He adapted Himself to our needs as every fresh crisis came. And so it is now. His mouth, put upon our wayward lips, enables us to speak the message which God would have us deliver. His eyes enable our blinded

[1] Galatians ii. 20. [2] 2 Kings iv. 34.

sight to see the wondrous things of His Law, and those things which, being spiritual, are spiritually discerned. His hands ride upon our hands that we may shoot the arrow of the Lord's deliverance.[1] 'Christ in you, the hope of glory.'[2] Such is the ideal which comes to us who are constantly fed from the Lord's Table. There is hope for our poor lives that, so nourished with the King's meat, we may in the end of the days stand before the King.[3]

We have already glanced at the doctrine called Transubstantiation which has played such a prominent part in the Eucharistic controversy. Reject it as we may, as a philosophical conceit, which fails to explain the inexplicable, there is nothing to prevent us from regarding it as typical of the change which grace should be effecting in us. Self should be falling away as we gradually become transubstantiated with Christ, His will absorbing and directing our will, His thoughts wrapping round our thoughts, His words speaking through our utterance, until Christ be formed in us in a Sacramental transfiguration. It is an ideal perhaps never to be fully realised, but an ideal immeasurably higher than that which would bid us follow the highest system of morality which perhaps the world has ever seen, and adapt our lives according to it. It is more than this: it is not so much to follow the precepts of a Master, it is to assimilate the life of God.[4]

[1] 2 Kings xiii. 16. [2] Coloss. i. 27. [3] Dan. i. 5.
[4] See reference on p. 42.

CHAPTER IX

EUCHARISTICAL ADORATION

'Nemo illam carnem manducat, nisi prius adoraverit.'

It is much to be regretted that so few of those who read Mr. Keble's *Christian Year* go on to read his learned treatise on Eucharistical Adoration. In it he shows that from the suggestions of natural piety, the sanction of the Holy Scriptures, the indications of the writings of the Fathers and the ancient Liturgies, the practice of the Primitive Church and the orders or recommendations of the Church of England, the adoration of Christ in the Eucharist, in some form or another, has been regarded as a necessity. 'It is as impossible for devout faith, contemplating Christ in the Sacrament, not to adore Him, as it is for a loving mother looking earnestly at her child not to love it.'

And yet there are few things so misunderstood, or made the subject of such cruel and reckless accusations as this devout adoration, which is the simple instinct of the devout heart.

This doctrine has indeed in recent times been

made a subject of legal prosecution in the Church of England. And it may be a comfort to those who attach weight to the Ecclesiastical Judgments so-called of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, to know that in the year 1872 Mr. Bennett was acquitted of promulgating doctrine contrary to the tenets of the Church of England, when he said, 'who myself adore and teach the people to adore Christ present in the Sacrament under the form of Bread and Wine, believing that under their veil is the sacred Body and Blood of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.' It is much to be wished that all passion and prejudice should be put on one side in considering a question so abstract and spiritual as Sacramental Worship. We have tried to show that the doctrines of the Real Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice, if rightly understood, are far removed from the coarse materialism which underlie so many of the charges brought against them. Such doctrines may be, and are, extremely difficult to understand or appreciate, but they are not obnoxious to the materialistic or subversive charges with which they are assailed. So with Eucharistic adoration, it is permissible to speak of its extreme mystery and sublimity, but the charge of idolatry, as brought against it, is utterly beside the point.

'Idolatry,' says Dr. Pusey, 'was for man (1) to worship any created thing or being, or any creature of his imagination, as God, beside the one true

God. This was forbidden by the First Commandment: "Thou shalt have no other Gods before Me." Or (2) it was for man to invent forms for himself, whereby to symbolise the Invisible God, and to worship Him under any symbols which God had not ordained, and where consequently He is not present in any special way of His own appointment. . . . But the presence of a material object, or of a creature, did not, in itself, interfere with the spiritual worship of God present there.'[1] So, he points out, the Theophanies of the Old Testament were made to some of the most spiritual persons, as Abraham, who merited to be called 'the friend of God.' It was no fire-god that Moses worshipped in the burning bush, but once more the Omnipresent Jehovah. It was no idolatry that the Israelites worshipped the Omnipresent in the Shechinah or created glory of the Tabernacle and Temple. It was not idolatry of which the shepherds and Magi were guilty when they worshipped the helpless infant of Bethlehem as Almighty God.

Frankly, we admit at once that no educated Christian would think of 'adoring the elements.' The phrase in itself is a misleading one. 'That were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians.' Neither do we 'adore the Sacrament' if that very ambiguous phrase means the *Sacramentum* or outward sign, for that is but another phrase for adoring the elements. But we do adore the Sacra-

[1] Dr. Pusey, *Real Presence*, pp. 328-330.

ment, in the sense that the Sacrament is the object and not the cause of our adoration, if by it is meant not the outward clothing and dress of the sacramental vehicle of Christ's Presence, but Him the verily and indeed present Saviour as the inward part of the Sacrament. The well-known words of Bishop Andrewes express what is meant with absolute clearness: '*Christ Himself, the substance of the Sacrament*, in and with the Sacrament, out of and without the Sacrament, wheresoever He is, is to be adored. But the king (James) laid down that *Christ, truly present in the Sacrament*, is also truly to be adored; He, the Substance of the Sacrament, but, *not the Sacrament, i.e.* "the earthly part," as Irenæus; the "Visible," as Augustine. But we in the Mysteries too "Adore the Flesh of Christ," with Ambrose, and not *that thing*, but—*Him* Who is worshipped on the Altar. For the Cardinal [Bellarmine] inquires amiss, *What* (Quid) is worshipped there? For he should have asked, *Who?* For Nazianzen says, "Him," not it . . . "Nor do we eat the Flesh, unless we have worshipped," saith Augustine. And yet we in no wise worship the Sacrament.'[1]

The point apparently which is now raised is that the Blessed Sacrament may well be allowed to kindle feelings of adoration, but that the adoration must not be directed to the Sacred Humanity as

[1] Trans. by Dr. Pusey, *Real Presence*, 316, 317, of Andrewes' *Reponsio ad Card. Bellar. Apol.*, Anglo-Catholic Library, p. 266.

present under the sacramental veils; that the Blessed Sacrament may in no sense be an *object* of devotion, but merely the *occasion* of lifting up our hearts to the worship of the Sacred Humanity as it exists in heaven in the mystery of the Hypostatic Union. But surely if there is any fear of a materialised or earthly conception, bound under earthly conditions such as we are familiar with, in such phrases as 'the Prisoner of the Tabernacle,' and the like, it ought not to be difficult for the adoring soul to rise with Christ out of such cramping limitations. One has stated his belief as follows in view of the difficulty thus raised: 'I conceive that wherever the Consecrated Bread is, there is the pledged Presence of the Sacred Humanity; which although endowed with the subtle attributes of spirit is not ubiquitous. I conceive that such presence of the Sacred Manhood makes a demand upon us for our adoring regard, which, quickened by the thought "Jesus is here," ought to rise to the farther thought, "We are through Him in heaven."'

Surely whatever we should have done when confronted with the presence of our Blessed Lord in the days of His earthly ministry, we should do now in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament. Is it said that our Lord's glorified Humanity is in Heaven? Is it said, with Cardinal Newman, that 'our Lord is *in loco* in Heaven, not (in the same sense) in the Sacrament? He is present in the

Sacrament only in substance, *substantive*, and substance does not require or imply the occupation of place.' Still we shall go on to say with him, 'He is in the Holy Eucharist after the manner of a spirit. We do not know how: we have no parallel to the "how" in our experience. We can only say that He is present, not according to the natural manner of bodies, but *sacramentally*. His Presence is substantial, spirit-wise, sacramental: an absolute mystery, not against reason, however, but against imagination, and must be received by faith.'[1]

The vesture of the Sacramental Presence, and the pledge to us that it is there, is surely the outward part of the Sacrament. And if worship be directed there, where the manifestation becomes real to us although invisible, under an outward and visible sign, we are no more to be accounted idolaters than the Apostles, if they worshipped what they knew to be Christ under the covering of His earthly vesture, if they worshipped God under the robe of human flesh in the mystery of the Incarnation. 'I will worship toward Thy Holy Temple,'[2] led by the gracious manifestation of Himself which God has vouchsafed to grant.

It may be that a good deal depends on the outward manifestation of adoration and reverence to the Blessed Sacrament, more than appears at first sight. It is quite possible to hold as a theory remote and visionary, the great truth of the Sacra-

[1] Newman, quoted on pp. 96, 97.

[2] Psalm xxxviii. 2.

mental Presence of our Blessed Lord in the Holy Sacrament, but it is only when we begin to act upon that belief and push it to its natural consequences in adoration and worship that we realise what it means in its full mystery and divine comfort.[1] But we would once more most earnestly protest that that cannot be chargeable with idolatry which is the worship of Christ in the most immaterial way possible, beneath the absolutely impenetrable veil of that which by its material species could never attract adoration or do anything else but bid us look beneath it.

It was said by one, talking of the outward expressions of respect, that if a friend came into the room where we were sitting, we should exhibit some token of recognition: if Shakespeare came in we should all stand up, but if our Blessed Lord came in we should all kneel down. And if we realise the Presence at all, however unable we may be to give a scientific account of our belief, it is difficult to see how we can do less than worship.

We must all jealously and carefully guard that portion of the sacred doctrine of the Incarnation, that the manhood is taken into God, and that therefore divine worship is inseparable from any manifesta tion of the Sacred Humanity. And farther, as Mr. Keble reminds us by many instances in his treatise,

[1] Two cases have occurred in the writer's experience where belief in the Real Presence first became a practical reality, and not merely a theory, from witnessing the outward adoration displayed by a worshipper towards the Blessed Sacrament.

every fresh humiliation of the Incarnate Son seemed to challenge a fresh act of adoration. 'The hymn of congratulation at our Lord's birth, and the lowly ministry and homage after the proclamation of His Baptism . . . were each of them reserved, as it were, until His mysterious humiliation had been announced by additional circumstances. The multitude of the heavenly host did not sing *Gloria in Excelsis* until they had heard of the swaddling-bands and the manger; the angels did not come and minister unto Him Who was declared the only-begotten and beloved Son until He had been cast out into the wilderness, had abode there forty days fasting, with no companions but the wild beasts, and (most mysterious and fearful self-abasement) Satan tempting Him.'[1] And so the exceeding lowliness of His Sacramental Presence should in itself induce in us the desire of such reparation as we are able to make. 'Was Jesus the Name, among all His names, most expressive of His deep humiliation? So are the sacramental elements among all the means of grace, both as being in themselves so cheap and ordinary, and as representing especially His Death and Passion.'[2]

But it may be said, How can this be held in view of the common doctrine and practice of Roman Catholics? To which it may be sufficient to answer that no doctrine or practice is to be condemned

[1] Mr. Keble, *Eucharistic Adoration*, p. 16.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 27.

simply because it is customary to Roman Catholics, unless it can also be shown to be absolutely forbidden to English Churchmen, or to be repugnant to the Word of God. We do not necessarily get nearer to the truth the further removed we are from anything which is held sacred by Roman Catholics.

But as to the formularies of the Church of England. 'The Black Rubric,' whatever authority it may be supposed to possess, cannot be quoted against such adoration as we have alluded to above, being more 'directed against the heresy of "Ubiquitism," as though our Lord's "Natural Body" had the properties belonging to His Divine Nature,'[1] than against Eucharistical adoration so called. Neither will the Article XXVIII. bear all the inferences which it is sought to derive from it. It may very well be supposed to assert, which indeed we are not concerned to deny, that 'the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance' given to us for the sake of the comparatively late development of the worship connected with the Tabernacle and the Monstrance. But this is a very different thing from saying that when our Blessed Lord is sacramentally present for all the purposes for which He ordained His Sacrament, we are not permitted to worship Him for fear of idolatry.[2]

[1] Dr. Pusey, *The Real Presence*, p. 319. See also above.

[2] See further on this mysterious subject, Wilberforce, *The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, chap vi.

Arising out of the doctrine of Eucharistical adoration, there remain to be considered two things which both have their origin ultimately in a belief in our Lord's Sacramental Presence. The one is the frequenting of the Holy Eucharist for purposes of worship and intercession, when there is no intention at that moment of receiving the sacred gifts; and the other the whole question of Ritual, which, if it mean anything at all, should centre round the homage paid to a present King.

As to the first, which is known as 'non-communicating attendance,' and has been and is a subject of fierce controversy, although now a rapidly increasing custom in the English Church, it is necessary to make at the outset a clear distinction between the non-communicating attendance on any given occasion of devout communicants, and the non-communicating attendance of habitual non-communicants, who correspond to the 'gazers and lookers-on' who were ordered out of church in the strongly-worded exhortation of the Communion Office of 1552.

It is commonly asserted that non-communicating attendance at the Holy Communion has a formidable foe in Mr. Keble, who wrote in a letter as follows: 'I cannot deny that I have a strong feeling against the foreign custom of encouraging *all sorts of persons* to "assist" at the Holy Eucharist without communicating. It seems to me open to two grave objections. It cannot be without danger

of profaneness and irreverence, to very many, and of consequent dishonour to the Holy Sacrament; and it has taught us and encouraged, or both (at least so I greatly suspect) a notion of a quasi-sacramental virtue in such attendance, which I take to be a great part of the error stigmatised in our 31st Article. Even in such a good book as the *Imitatio Christi*, and still more in the *Paradisus animæ*, one finds participating *in Missâ vel Communione* spoken of as if one brought a spiritual benefit of the same sort as the other. This I believe to be utterly unauthorised by Scripture or antiquity; and I can imagine it of very dangerous consequence. But whatever one thought of this, the former objection would still stand, and it would not do to answer that the early Church allowed or even encouraged the practice; because, even if that were granted (I very much doubt it, to say the least), the existence of discipline at that time entirely alters the case. . . . Yet of course I cannot deny that there may be any number of cases in which attendance without communicating may be morally and spiritually (I could not say sacramentally) beneficial. And in default of discipline, I should advise any person who thought that such was his own case, to consult with his spiritual adviser, and act accordingly; the clergyman of the particular church not objecting.'[1]

[1] Mr. Keble, *Letters of Spiritual Counsel and Guidance*. Third edition, cxxviii. pp. 230, 231.

Here it will be seen that Mr. Keble is objecting to two things. One 'the attendance of *all sorts of persons*' (the italics are his) at the mysteries; the other, the growth of the idea of a 'quasi-sacramental grace,' as he says in another letter, attaching to this custom. As to the first of these, it is certainly a very grave question whether the Holy Mysteries so jealously guarded of old by the expulsion of catechumens, energumens and penitents, and hid behind the symbolism of barrier and screen and veil in the ancient system of reserve, should be open to the gaze of those who not only are not going to communicate at that time, but who are not communicants at all, and not fit to be. But this is quite another thing to the attendance without communicating at any given time on the part of the faithful Communicant, who is unable or not qualified for some ceremonial reason, or unwilling from reverence, to receive the Holy Communion at this particular moment. No doubt the second evil which Mr. Keble feared, of substituting the less for the greater, or of getting to believe that an attendance of this kind had a quasi-sacramental value, may be a real one, and needs constant watching. But he himself in this very letter speaks of the very many to whom this practice may be spiritually beneficial, and whom he advises to take spiritual direction on the subject.

And it is of these we are speaking now, of the constant and earnest Communicants, who feel

justified on certain occasions in asserting their right to be present for worship and participation in the great pleading, although at that moment they are not prepared to communicate.

It has been proposed from time to time to insert a rubric to forbid the presence of any who do not intend to communicate, at the Holy Eucharist, whatever may be their motive for so attending, notably in 1563, when Convocation was petitioned by the Puritans to enact 'that no person abide within the Church during the time of Communion unless he do communicate.' This petition was then rejected, and all similar petitions made at other times have met with a similar fate. This would certainly seem to show that such a devotional habit was legal, and neither against the letter, nor, as we shall hope to show, the spirit of the Church's laws. One word of digression may be permitted about the question of legality, which has figured so disastrously in the extravagant and useless lawsuits of the past forty years. It may be that it is difficult to say of this or that custom that it is legal, in the sense that it is not possible to single out any enactment ordering or sanctioning its use. On the other hand, it has been found to be quite possible in the intricacies and subtleties of the legal mind to turn round from their plain and obvious meaning such enactments as those of the ornaments rubric in the interests of a supposed expediency. It may be that without lapsing into a lawless con-

gregationalism, we shall more and more have to realise that there are certain periods in the history of a provincial church which may be called times of experiment, when, in view of new complications arising from new conditions of life such as are presented by the state of our large cities, or the growth of æsthetic culture, even fresh forms of religious service will have to be enterprised, always in submission to spiritual authority, and when the rigid appeal to the Chinese exactness of ritual and ceremonial uniformity will have to be abandoned. Certainly it would be ironical in the last degree if in a day when all manner of devices, some of them very questionable, are enterprised in order to allure people to church, those churches which are now filled with a devout and earnest congregation to celebrate the Holy Mysteries should be emptied in compliance with the supposed demands of a rigid legalism.

It would not be difficult to show, as has been indicated above, that there is nothing to forbid non-communicating attendance in our formularies, that there are some indications which seem to imply it, although there is nothing positively to order it.

But we would rather ask here, Why should the devout Communicant not be allowed to be present at the Holy Mysteries, if he so desire it, although for the moment he is not prepared to receive the Blessed Sacrament? Does Antiquity forbid him? Surely not. Antiquity indeed would be strangely startled at many things in our way of conducting our Sunday

worship, but surely not at the presence of the faithful at the Liturgy. Justin Martyr tells us of what went on in the assembly of the faithful in the second century 'on the day which is called Sunday.' He tells us of the sacred lections, the sermon, the oblation of a mixed chalice, the long Eucharistic prayer of 'the President,' the congregational Amen, the Communion of the faithful, the Communion of the sick with the Sacrament reserved from the public service, the oblations and alms, the intercession, and the kiss of peace—coupling it all to the statement: 'But Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly, because it is the first day on which God, when He changed the darkness and matter, made the world; and Jesus Christ our Saviour on the same day rose from the dead; for the day before that of Saturn He was crucified, and on the day after it, which is Sunday, He appeared to His Apostles and disciples, and taught them these things, which we have given to you also, for your consideration.'[1] If Justin Martyr were to write an apology to the powers that be of the present day, would he not be startled to find the predominant form of Sunday worship absolutely without any definite relation to the Lord's own service which He ordered to be had in perpetual observation? Would he not be surprised to see the Holy Mysteries superseded by a choir-office on the Lord's Day? Would he not be surprised to know

[1] Justin Martyr, *Apol.*, i. 65, 66, 67.

that the times were not so far distant when the Lord's service was celebrated at rare intervals, with hardly any congregation of the faithful to participate in it, at an altar unworthy of its sacred purpose, by a priest with no outward sign distinctive of his office, using a book in which the Liturgy was printed in small type, as quite a minor office for such as might desire it?

The appeal to Antiquity would certainly be on the side of those who wish, it may be in mistaken ways, but who still wish to elevate the Divine Liturgy to take its proper place in the outward worship and inward affections of the faithful.

If it be said that Antiquity would not recognise the presence of a non-communicating body of worshippers, as tending to elevate the dignity of the Holy Eucharist, this may be doubted. It may be that in the early fervour of Christianity the faithful communicated always at least on the Lord's Day, that then there was no question of admitting to the Divine Mysteries those who deemed themselves unfit to partake of the Sacred Food, but rather of excluding, of driving out, all who were judged to be unworthy. Still we must notice this fact, that as time went on, and the stream of the world began to mingle with the Church, necessitating a very elaborate system of penitential discipline, there grew up a recognition in certain well-defined cases of a class of people who were not as yet capable spiritually of receiving

the Mysteries, but who might be allowed as a privilege, not as a penance, to be present at the Divine Liturgy, awaiting the time of their full restoration to Christian privileges.

The *Consistentes*, as they were called, who had passed through the other grades of penitence, as *Flentes*, *audientes*, and *substrati*, were permitted, as their penance now drew to a close, to partake in an imperfect but still in a valued way of the privileges of the full Christian. It may be that the devout non-communicant of the present day, that is the occasional non-communicant, at some special service, may occupy spiritually a position somewhat analogous to that of the *Consistentes* of the Primitive Church. He feels his unworthiness to receive the divine gift so frequently; he feels that the burden of his sins, strive as he will against them, weighs him down. His attitude is not dictated by faithlessness nor religious sloth, but by a keen faith and sense of his position, which makes him abstain in the same spirit of reverence as that which makes another approach. It is a matter between him and God, which a man must be left to decide for himself, as indeed he is allowed by our Communion Office to decide for himself the time and manner of his penitential preparation for Communicating.

The appeal to Antiquity would land us in a principle which, before anything else, would consider the guarding of the approach to the Sacra-

ment, its dignity, and the reverence required from all who seek it.

If we go back farther still, behind Christian antiquity, the analogy of the Jewish sacrifices would be in favour of a permissive participation in the rite, even without partaking always and everywhere. The daily Sacrifice of the Temple was a burnt-offering of which the people never partook. And it has been well pointed out with reference to the Jew: 'They could not eat without offering, but they continually offered without eating.'[1]

If Antiquity does not forbid the Christian thus to frequent the Sacrament without communicating, is there anything in the history or tendency of the practice which should deter him? We have to face the fact that this custom is universal throughout the Church, East and West, and few things are more solemn as an act of worship than the Liturgy of the Eastern Church. If we may press an allusion in the writings of Dr. Milligan,[2] it would seem also that in the administration of the Lord's Supper in Scotland the Presbyterians are accustomed to admit children and others who do not partake at the time. But still it cannot be denied that in the period immediately preceding the Reformation Communions would seem to have been exceedingly rare, as they are to-day in Eastern

[1] See author's *Religion*, pp. 270-275. See also Bishop Gore, *The Body of Christ*, pp. 202, 203.

[2] Quoted in author's *Religion*, p. 273. See also below, p. 213.

Christendom, and that the tendency of encouraging the attendance of the faithful, or to make it of obligation, has been in the past to obscure the Communion side of the service, and to make attendance at the Eucharist a substitute for devout participation.

Human tendencies are difficult things to deal with, and at the end it must always be remembered that *abusus non tollit usum.* It is well to consider the following facts. First, that in the Western Church of the Roman obedience, where non-communicating attendance is a regular practice, it is by no means the case that Communions are rare.[1] Secondly, in England, fifty years ago, the practice of making the Holy Communion almost a secret and esoteric service was resulting in a nation of practical non-communicants. Thirdly, at the present day it is by no means the fact, but very much the contrary, that the number of Communicants is less at those churches where non-communicating attendance is encouraged than it is at those where it is not.

The practice of devout attendance at the Holy Mysteries, although it would not be right to ignore its history or its possible tendencies, must yet be studied in itself. What is the *rationale* of it? What is the virtue of it? What does it presuppose in the worshipper? How much is it to be

[1] See the statistics given by Mr. Coles in his pamphlet, *Daily Communion* (W. Knott), pp. 4, 5.

taken into account in the arrangement and conduct of church services?

At a time like this, when there is an eager craving for success and a worship of statistics, when attraction is supposed to condone even irreverence, it is well to remember that divine worship does not exist first and foremost for the edification of man. In the arrangement of the Sunday service, for instance, it is not sufficient to have ascertained, it may be by painful experiment, that the attendance of worshippers at the Holy Eucharist compares unfavourably with that at other and less solemn services. The worship of the Church is pre-eminently a service offered to Almighty God. The Magi who crossed the desert to offer their gifts to the new-born King are typical of all true worshippers who come to offer gifts, not to receive edification. And it must always be a cause of searchings of heart if elaborate choirs are maintained at great expense which are never allowed to consecrate their powers in the highest service of which the Church is capable, simply because the effort does not seem to attract a large congregation. It is the offering to God which ought first to be considered in the outpouring of gifts at once costly, reverent, and self-sacrificing. 'Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained?' asks the Catechism. 'For the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby,' is the answer. The

showing forth before God of the Lord's death is, as we have seen, the primary function of this great rite, upon which follows the sanctification and edification of man.

Further, Dr. Milligan attests with truth,[1] that 'the worship of the Church is primarily, and it has been historically, intended for the edification of saints rather than the conversion of sinners. Not to convert the world did Christians of old gather together in private chambers, or catacombs, or dens of the earth, or basilicas, or cathedrals, or parish churches, but to strengthen their own faith, to deepen their own convictions, and to enjoy the consolations provided for them amidst their trials.'

It is necessary sometimes to insist that the faithful are those who are most to be considered in church worship. The Holy Eucharist has no doubt a great evidential value; it is helpful also in leading on those who are as yet strangers to their privileges, to a due appreciation of them; but it is, and always has been, the privilege and joy of the Christian family. Zacchaeus is not to be despised if he comes to that place where he knows that Jesus will be passing by, even if as yet he has no hope of a closer intercourse with Him. The Centurion is not to be blamed if he believes that without personal communion he may receive the blessing which he would crave by a humble trusting in His unfettered power.

[1] Milligan, *The Ascension*, p. 302.

The devout Christian who frequents the altar, without at every time receiving the divine gifts, does so not as one who despises, but as one who reverences. He knows that nothing can ever make up for want of Communion; he knows the difference between those days when he receives and those in which he humbly adores while Jesus passes by; but in both cases he can say, 'Lord, it is good for us to be here.' And the devout Communicant will accustom himself when he does not feel able for some reason to receive the Blessed Sacrament to make an act of spiritual Communion, such as is provided in many books of devotion. The real attitude of his soul will be that of the man who longs more and more to realise the presence of God. He is no gazer or onlooker, but he is one who craves ever for a fuller realisation of his privileges as a Churchman. To him daily Communion is the ideal after which he aims, but reverence restrains him from too great familiarity. He fears to invite Christ to a house too bare for His honourable reception. He would have ready the water of a truer penitence with which to bathe His feet, and would wipe them with the devotion of a true and earnest amendment. He would wish to greet Him with the kiss of welcome, but fears lest it should be the kiss of Judas, lest he should betray while he welcomes. He would prepare the oil of a glad and cheerful holiness wherewith to honour and greet the Heavenly Guest. Certainly

the non-communicant has his preparation to make, his intention to offer, his devotion to render, as well as he who approaches to the fullness of his privilege. He too would say, 'Lord, I believe; I would believe more firmly. Lord, I love; I would love more warmly. Lord, I grieve; I would grieve more deeply.'

Adoration, worship, waiting upon God are, it may be, attitudes of the soul which are not much in favour in a time of great activity, manifold energies, and multiplied work, but they are needed more than anything else to steady the soul, to deepen devotion, and to kindle love. Let us do all that we can to take such a subject as Eucharistic adoration out of the legal coercion of more or less restriction. Love and affection cannot be regulated by law, as between those whom God unites in His love. A child's love to his parent cannot be regulated by acts of uniformity or human restrictions. There are certain things which are between God and His children, which display on the one hand, and coldness on the other, would equally betray. If it be true that *pectus facit theologum*, *pectus* must also be allowed to have its say in the intimacy of Eucharistic worship.

If Dr. Milligan pleads for the children in Scotland, that they should 'remain in the church during the celebration of the Supper, because they are not strangers,'[1] the devout Christian may also plead that

[1] *The Ascension*, p. 304. See also above, p. 208.

he should be allowed to claim his privilege as a child of God, and as a member of the great family which claim Jesus Christ as their Elder Brother in the Father's House.

The privilege of worship at the time of special manifestation of the nearness of His Presence is the peculiar right of sons, a privilege of which no controversy can rob us. God grant that the weary echoes of polemical bitterness may die away from the sacred precincts of the altar, as they died away in the heart of him on whom Christ had conferred the blessing of restored sight when he said: 'Whether He be a sinner or no, I know not: one thing I know, that, whereas I was blind, now I see.'[1]

[1] S. John ix. 25.

CHAPTER X

RITUAL

'Faciesque Vestem Sanctam Aaron fratri tuo in gloriam et decorem.'

It has been said in the previous chapter that much of what is loosely known as ritual depends ultimately on the realisation of the Sacramental Presence of our Lord in His Church here below.[1] And this may account in some way for the disproportionate importance which has been given to ritual in the attacks brought to bear on the Catholic position during the last forty years. As long as the forgotten truths, which it was sought to bring out, lay hid in documents and treatises, it was possible to ignore them; when they were brought out in popular form in tract and sermon they began to arouse popular prejudice and opposition: but when they quite naturally began to express themselves in ceremonial and outward symbolism, then the suspicions of men, impatient of long-forgotten truths, found vent in actual violence.

[1] On worship, see author's *Religion*, p. 255 and ff.

Riots and imprisonment of supposed offenders were reserved for 'Ritualists.' It was the old story :—

> 'Segnius irritant animos demissa per aurem
> Quam quæ sunt oculis subjecta fidelibus et quæ
> Ipse sibi tradit spectator.'[1]

And yet here, too, men have found it almost impossible to withhold from God the bodily adoration which expresses the homage of the heart; and all attempts to suppress what is after all a natural impulse have met with the fate which always awaits those who attempt to force an irresistible stream. It is the fashion to say that ritual and ceremonial are childish and unimportant. In one sense this is true, in other senses most untrue. Nothing can be more pitiful of its kind than the overloaded and vulgar ornamentation of that which is significant of no inner truth. A ceremonial which springs from æstheticism, and ministers to human display, is to be most earnestly deprecated. A defence of ceremonial based on its insignificance cannot be accepted. If it means nothing it is self-condemned. It represents only the over-ornamentation of a house in which the final cause of a dwelling-place has been sacrificed to ornament. But, on the other hand, ritual and ceremonial, which are the expression of great truths connected with divine worship, can never be anything else but important. It is impossible with the revelation of God in our hand, whether in the Old or New Testament, to say that

[1] Horace, *De Arte Poetica*, 180-1-2.

they are displeasing to Almighty God. It would be possible to say a great deal more. It is difficult, having regard to the constitution of our human nature, to say that such things are of no account in our provision for man's needs. It would be possible to show that outward things which affect the senses may be both a hindrance and a help, and are by no means indifferent. But it must be remembered that such questions when they affect public worship are not left to individual caprice. The Church has her dogmatic utterances, her doctrinal truths, on which her divine worship is based; and ritual or ceremonial are imposed by the rubrics, and tradition which regulates that worship, without regard to the immediate wants of the worshipper.

If any one will study even the outlines of the fascinating history of Liturgies, he will find that this from the first has been the underlying motive, the doing of a great public work, a State function, an offering to a present God of public homage, in which the individual is no more consulted than he would be in the details of a court function at Buckingham Palace. It is surely to argue on a wrong tack to say that ceremonial was designed to help the worshipper in his devotions. It is always harder to offer a service, such as the worshipper would wish to offer, with ceremonial than without: in the sense that his offering is larger and more extensive. He is not only offering the myrrh of self-denial, or the gold of inner worth,

but the incense of worship, in itself a difficult and costly act. But he must sink his own feelings and shortcomings: it is a State homage which is being offered to a present King, with a tithe of all that art and beauty can devise as worthy of His presence, in which the edification of man is the secondary not the primary consideration. This has been judged so important, that it has formed the subject of a minute and careful tradition, which our opening rubric, the rubric which governs the ritual of our public worship, assumes with one glance back into ceremonial history, which is regulated here and corrected there, or preserved elsewhere; but always with the respect felt to be due to the outward setting of a great spiritual act. It may be that in other parts of the Church this aspect of things has been pressed out of proportion. Here is a magnificent State function, but where is the simple worship of the heart, whose absence we are always ready to assume in surroundings unfamiliar to ourselves? Here again, in some simple village church in England, are many people saying their prayers with great earnestness in public, led by their spokesman, but where is the great act of worship?

The ideal surely would be that both these types of devotion should be combined in one act of worship; but it is just here that human weariness and human limitations come in. It is easy simply to feel the general elevation and æsthetic thrill of stately movement, delicate shades of colour, musical

sounds, sweet odour of incense, and the like, and here bend the knee or bow the head, shutting off the treasures, as yet unlocked, of the reasonable and lively sacrifice of the inner man. It is easy to close the eyes, and withdraw within oneself, in the mere intellectual appreciation of a rhythmic prayer, or even the spiritual acceptance of it as a vehicle of devotion. But in both these cases the whole man has not been used, and day by day we are realising in greater fullness that the body will not consent to be a passive spectator, either in things intellectual or spiritual: it can hinder if it does not help. And the Incarnation, with its glorious elevation of the whole man, must protest against a worship which excludes any part of our composite being from offering the homage due from the creature to the Creator.

If we once concede the principle of a House built for God Who dwelleth not in temples made with hands, our churches will naturally be the scenes of an earthly worship of God, not symbolical or subversive of the ceaseless worship in heaven, but united with it, and taking their part in the realisation of that doctrine enunciated above, namely, that in the Holy Eucharist there is a mingling of the earthly and heavenly, either that the earthly altar is elevated to heaven, or that the heavenly altar is merged with the earthly here below; which postulates the fullness of worship, and which sheds over even the empty and now silent Church the

fragrance of a Presence, and the lingering beauty of a great visit, which has rendered the place of His feet glorious.

Ritual ceremonial, artistic effort, whether we like them or not, would appear to have come to stay. They are being pressed on us now by those who are separated from us and traditionally opposed to them. It will be a calamity if we accept æstheticism which tends to a superficial formalism, and reject symbolism which connects the outward with the inward, and consecrates the material with the spiritual.

A ceremonial which is without doctrinal significance is worse than useless; it is dangerous to spiritual realities.

Specifically, it will not be amiss to glance at these accessories of divine worship, and to study some of the details of Eucharistic service, which, once more, are not left to our individual caprice, our likes and dislikes, but come down to us with a venerable tradition from remote antiquity, and which we value accordingly, not because a special symbolism is attached to them, which it would be impossible otherwise to secure, but because with them are associated the venerable doctrines and beliefs which make us feel more keenly the present power of the Communion of Saints, and the oneness of the great liturgical act, which the Church has sought to perfect all down the ages, and which links us to the piety and devotion of the past.

First of all, let us take the outward *instrumenta* of the service, and of these the altar must claim our first attention. It is not within the immediate scope of this present volume to refer at any length to the liturgical or archæological questions which gather round the history of the Christian altar. The reader is referred to an earlier volume of this series, and to other authorities which deal with this branch of the subject.[1]

Viewed in its spiritual significance, it surely is a matter for thanksgiving that we should be reminded by the very prominence given to it of Jesus Christ and our salvation. For many years in England the pulpit in our churches eclipsed the altar. That has now been changed; and it is well that it should be so, as there is an ever-increasing need, in view of false conceptions of the work and person of our Lord, to put first His mediatorial work, in its ever-abiding and unchanging efficacy. He is our Saviour first, and our Teacher in the second place. And were it not for an unreasoning prejudice against the supposed return of mediæval errors, there could be no possible reason why we should regard with other feelings than of thankful joy the altar which ranges in line with the sacrificial pleading of our Lord in heaven. We give it the highest honour in view of the position which

[1] See Frere, *The Principles of Religious Ceremonial*; Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*, second edition, p. 196; Luckock, *The Divine Liturgy*, chap. vi.

the Atonement holds in the theological system of the Church, and we reverence it also as the seat of His special Presence, as the throne of the sovereign is respected, even when the sovereign does not occupy it. The simple reverence to the altar which has never wholly died out in England is of no little value as a recognition on the part of those who use it of the respect due to the House of God, and to the seat of His imparted grace.

The altar itself, as is customary now, is decorated with significant ornaments. The Cross is there with an obvious symbolism, which it is unnecessary to point out.[1] And there are also lights and flowers, probably as signs of thankfulness and rejoicing rather than with any definite symbolism attached to them, although both before and after the Reformation the lights were taken to signify generally that Christ is the very true light of the world.[2] In the same category will be placed all the various hangings for the altar, the reredos and other decorations. They are for glory and beauty with the general symbolism attaching to them, that we must labour to surround the scene of our liturgical worship with majesty and honour.

Perhaps even more significant are the simpler and less striking provisions made in the rubrics for

[1] For the development of the use of Cross and lights, see Hedley, *The Holy Eucharist*, pp. 212, 213.

[2] See Archbishop Benson's exhaustive judgment, Read *v.* the Bishop of Lincoln. Published by Macmillan, 1890.

linen coverings of the altar and for those of the sacred vessels, called commonly *corporals*, carrying with them, not the symbolism of a cloth laid for a meal, but of the linen clothes used at the burial of Christ. Here is one symbolism at all events which no vexed interpretation of rubrics can interfere with, that all which is used for so sacred a purpose should be scrupulously clean and tidy. For gorgeous embroidery which appeals to the eye consorts ill with linen neither fair nor clean, neglected too often because it is not seen by the eye of the ordinary worshipper.

In addition to these ornaments of the Church, it has been customary from very early days that the priest who celebrates the Mysteries should put on him vestments distinctive of the service he has to perform. This question of the Eucharistic vestments has been allowed in recent times to assume a prominence quite out of proportion to its real importance. And, as so often happens, a thing intrinsically of only secondary value may come to be regarded as a matter involving grave principle, by reason of real or imaginary issues supposed to be bound up in it. It is quite impossible in view of recent controversies to dismiss such questions with an epigram, or demolish them with a sneer as having to do with 'ecclesiastical millinery,' with which they are no more concerned than a regimental colour with street decorations. The outbreak of the Indian Mutiny for ever bids us to despise the insignificant causes of

big convulsions. It would be also open to doubt, both from the nature of things and also from Holy Scripture, whether the vesture of those who are engaged in leading the worship of God is quite the trivial thing which it has been sometimes assumed to be.

It is only fair, however, to say that the tendency of the more recent opposition to Eucharistic vestments has been to fasten on the supposed fact that they are distinctive of unsound doctrine, rather than to regard them as contemptible and insignificant.

Here again, as to the vexed question of the Ornaments' Rubric, the reader must be referred to the earlier volumes of this series, and to the controversial literature to which it has given rise. It must suffice in this chapter to give some general indications of their symbolism and use, which are neither superstitious nor insignificant, and to try and show how, apart from controversial bitterness and the unreasonable suspicion of anything which appears to be novel, there is nothing in the Eucharistic vestments to arouse anything but feelings of piety and devotion, to sink the man and elevate the priest, and further to sink the priest and elevate Christ. The symbolism of the Eucharistic vestments may be summed up in the one Apostolic phrase, 'putting on Christ.' Each and all they speak of Christ and remind us of His Passion and Death, that He, not man, is the real

celebrant, and that the action of the Eucharist is more in heaven than on earth.

Before proceeding to discuss this in detail, it may perfectly well be conceded, that in the earliest days, perhaps until the fifth or sixth century, there were no distinctive vestments, differing, that is, from the ordinary clothing of life, used by those who ministered in the public services; and yet it would be right to say that these were of a special character, both in priests and assisting laity, worthy of the solemn occasion.[1]

It may also be freely admitted that the sacerdotal symbolism, connecting them with the Jewish rites, and also symbolism in general as attached to them, were a later growth, arising out of devotion and piety. Still there grew up, as the Church was enabled to put forth her strength and put on her garment of beauty, a significance which was minute and helpful to man, and full of devotion to our great High Priest, Jesus Christ. And who shall say that there is not a real need of forgetting the man while we accept his ministration? There is a true sense in which we may accept the misleading phrase, 'We do not want any one between us and God.' If we know as a fact that the unworthiness of the minister does not invalidate his sacramental acts to the faithful, or prevent these from becoming to them means of grace, still it is only too possible to be haunted at solemn moments by the

[1] See Bishop Hedley, *The Holy Eucharist*, p. 202 and ff.

shadow of human personality. Look at some portrait of a popular preacher in the last century and compare it with the effigy of some priest clad in Eucharistic vestments: it is not hard to see in which of the two the man stands out with the most troublesome individuality. We are all acquainted with the expression which bids us think of 'Mr. So-and-So's church,' or 'the place where Mr. So-and-So preaches.' And the symbolism of the vestments tends emphatically to sink the man in Christ. So in the well-known words of the author of *The Imitation of Christ*: 'A priest clad in sacred vestments is Christ's deputy, that with all supplication and humility, he may beseech God for himself and for the whole people. He hath before and behind him the sign of the Cross that he may ever remember the Passion of Christ. He carries the Cross before him on his chasuble that he may diligently contemplate the footsteps of Christ, and fervently study to follow them. Behind him he is signed with the Cross, that he may suffer with gentleness for God's sake whatever may be brought against him by others. He carries the Cross before him that he may bewail his own sins; behind him that in compassion he may weep for the sins of others, and know that he is placed in the midst between God and the sinner, and so grow not weary of prayer and the holy oblation, until he be accounted worthy to obtain grace and pity. When a priest celebrateth,

he honoureth God, he rejoiceth angels, he edifieth the Church, he helpeth the living, he affords rest to the departed, and maketh himself to participate in all good things.'[1]

The particular symbolism of the vestments is as follows. The first that is put on is the amice, a linen cloth worn round the neck, which, from the custom of placing it on over the head before it is adjusted, has led it to be associated with the idea of 'the helmet of salvation'; another symbolism connects it with the veil with which the Jews covered the head of Jesus;[2] while a third still, which appears in the Roman Pontifical, associates it with 'the due repression of the voice.' *Castigatio vocis* is the phrase,[3] reminding us of 'the pure heart and humble voice' of the Prayer Book.

The alb, or linen tunic, with tight-fitting sleeves and reaching down to the feet, is of obvious significance, and is perhaps the oldest of Eucharistic vestments, taking our thoughts back to Christ arrayed by Herod in a shining robe, or as seen by the Apostle in glory 'clothed with a garment down to the foot.'[4] 'Purify me, O Lord, and cleanse my heart,' such is the prayer that rises to the lips, 'that being made white in the Blood of the Lamb I may enjoy delights eternal.' The girdle, necessary as it

[1] *The Imitation of Christ*, IV. chap. v. 3.

[2] See Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*. Second edition, p. 77. See also Bishop Hedley, p. 206.

[3] See the authorities quoted above.

[4] Rev. I. 13.

is to keep the long, flowing robe in its place, so that it does not get in the way of the feet, quickly received its symbolism. It represents to the pious mind the cords which bound Jesus, or the thongs which scourged Him, and it received further the idea of the life of self-control necessary to the priest, such as is expressed in the prayers associated with its use, 'Gird, O Lord, the loins of my mind,' 'Gird me, O Lord, with the girdle of righteousness,' and others in a similar strain. There is then another vestment attached to the left arm known as the maniple, which, probably taking its origin as a napkin for various purposes, has been elevated to a rank among the sacred vestments. In the prayer which accompanies its use it is spoken of as a badge of servitude: 'May I attain to carry the maniple of weeping and pain, that I may receive the reward of labour with rejoicing.' The stole, which is in such common use, not only for the Holy Eucharist, but also in other services, is thought to have had a utilitarian origin, like the maniple, being originally called *orarium* or kerchief; but when it was finally taken into use as a liturgical vestment, its name was changed, and greater dignity attached to it, and it was taken to signify the ropes which bound Christ to the pillar of the scourging, and the yoke of Christ's service which His priests must patiently bear. And the chasuble which covers all, its name signifying a little house, because it covers the whole man, symbolised the purple robe with which Pilate's

soldiers clothed Jesus Christ in mockery, after the scourging, while to the priest it suggests charity, as a virtue which seems to cover over and surpass all others.

To some this symbolism may seem frivolous, but it is difficult to say that regarded thus, as they have tended to be regarded since they became distinctive of the vesture in use at the Divine Liturgy, they denote any erroneous or strange doctrine; as has been stated above, from first to last they symbolise Christ, and are designed to remind us of His Passion and Death. And if there be some who shrink from the technical memorial in this service known as the Eucharistic Sacrifice, there are none who do not gladly welcome anything that reminds them of Christ's most Sacred Passion and Death, and His mystical Presence in some way manifested in the rite. So Dr. Moule, the Bishop of Durham, has said: 'I believe that if our eyes, like those of Elisha's servant at Dothan, were opened to the unseen, we should indeed behold our Lord present at our Communion. There and then, assuredly, if anywhere and at any time, He remembers His promise, "where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst of them." Such special presence, the promised congregational presence, is perfectly mysterious in mode, but absolutely true in fact; no creation of our imagination or emotion, but an object for our faith. I believe that our Lord, so present, not on

the Holy Table, but *at* it, would be seen Himself, in our presence, to bless the Bread and Wine for a holy use, and to distribute them to His disciples, saying to all and each, "Take, eat, this is My Body which was given for you. Drink ye all of this: this is My Blood of the New Covenant, which was shed for you for the remission of sins." I believe that we should worship Him thus present in the midst of us in His living grace, with unspeakable reverence, thanksgiving, joy, and love. We should revere the Bread and the Wine with a profound sense of their sacredness as given by Him in physical assurance of our joyful part, as believers in Him, and so as members of Him, in all the benefits of His Passion.'[1] He then proceeds to show how, in his opinion, the elements are mere signs, but still the eye of faith is fixed on Christ and His Sacrifice. And, therefore, even on this showing, in so far as the vestments spoken of above remind us of Christ, it is not necessary for any one to repudiate them, as *in themselves* signifying doctrine which the most extreme Protestant might think it necessary to repudiate.

The ritual of the altar has, however, extended much further than this. As the mediæval writers saw Christ in everything (as any one may see for himself who reads such a book as Dr. Neale's *Commentary on the Psalms*, or the passages quoted

[1] *Report of a Conference held at Fulham Palace*, October 1900, pp. 72, 73.

in Mr. Keble's Tract LXXXIX.), so the mediæval builders loved to find Christ in the most minute details of their building. The cruciform shape of the Church which they adopted was a sermon in stone, proclaiming the Gospel of the Passion. They would bend the chancel at an angle from the nave, so that those who witnessed it might think of the Holy Body bent on the Cross, or of the Sacred Head drooping in agony. They would sometimes surround the East End with a crown of chapels as a sort of royal diadem for the King Who reigned from the tree. They would come to the aid of Theology, and reverence her reserve and awe, by the symbolism of long-drawn aisles of screen and barrier and ascent which might prepare the worshipper to put the shoes from off his feet on ground so holy. Then the symbolism would change, and the great Rood would represent the Sacred Passion, and all that was within its gates would be typical of that Heaven to which the way was opened by the atoning Death of Christ on the Cross. And so where everything was symbolical, and every act was tinged with mystery, the symbolism was extended not to the building only, or to the accessories of divine worship, but to the worship itself.

Any intelligent reader of the ancient Liturgies, any one who has followed the details of the Oriental Liturgy, or of the Roman, Ambrosian or Mozarabic Rite, as said at this day, will feel that

he is contemplating a great drama. Before his eyes Jesus Christ is evidently set forth crucified. In such a book as Picart's *Religious Ceremonies* (and the same may be seen in some books of devotion provided for the use of worshippers at the altar) every detail of the service is set forth with its corresponding event in the history of the Passion. So minute is it that there are no less than thirty-five of these correspondences traced. For instance, the entrance to the altar is to remind us of Christ and His disciples going forth to the Garden of Gethsemane; the Kyrie, of the three-fold denial of S. Peter; the crossing over from the Epistle to the Gospel side, at the lections, of our Lord's being taken backwards and forwards from Pilate to Herod; the lifting off of the veils, of the spoiling Christ of His garments; the consecration, of the offering of Christ upon the Cross; the Communion, of Christ's Body laid in the grave; the blessing, of the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Church. All this may be regarded as foolish and fanciful, and the details no doubt are arbitrary and forced. Still when Ritual and Ceremonial have taken their rightful place as part of an offering of worship made to God as a present King; when we have done our utmost as our bounden duty to render to Him a tithe of the art and beauty with which we surround ourselves in our daily life at such pains and cost, there does remain a function for the imagination, for the æsthetic faculties of our

nature. They are not to be dismissed by a contemptuous decree of those who either are, or who fancy themselves to be, destitute of these faculties. Imagination can be a great help or a great hindrance; it is not a thing negligible. Our Blessed Lord bids us consider the lilies; He takes us for His divine teaching to the cornfields or the fisherman's net, to the mustard seed, to the hen and her brood, even to such ordinary processes of life as a woman baking, a lawsuit, or a marriage festivity. He surely would point out to us that the strong common sense on which people pride themselves may often be as the self-complacency of the colour blind in the presence of one who feels acutely the harmony or the discord of colours.

> 'He roved among the vale and streams,
> In the green wood and hollow dell;
> They were his dwellings night and day—
> But Nature ne'er could find the way
> Into the heart of Peter Bell.
>
> In vain, through every changeful year,
> Did Nature lead him as before:
> A primrose by a river's brim
> A yellow primrose was to him,
> And it was nothing more.'

The painter and the poet, by reason of their imaginative faculty, live in a fuller and richer world than the ordinary man. And we seem led on the highest authority to believe that this same faculty may be consecrated to higher uses still. Certainly the Devil knows its use. Any one who is at all

acquainted with his devices for ruining souls knows that suggestiveness and hidden allusion to evil are used by him with more deadly effect than even the coarse presentments of temptation in its naked ugliness. Evil imaginations form one of his most serious hindrances with which to injure and impede those whom he cannot destroy. Further, it must be remembered that the very bitterness of the attack on symbolism and ceremonial arises very often from those who in reality are most sensible to them, unconsciously to themselves. It is rare to find those who, while they prefer the decent ceremonial of divine worship, are yet forced to say they cannot worship without it. But it is not uncommon to find those who are so sensitive to it, and so dependent on the ceremonial of a negative character to which they have been accustomed, that without it they are unable even to say their prayers.

There are many dangers incident to ceremonial worship, but they are not to be swept away by an effort to bring about its total abolition. It cannot be done. Human nature can be regulated, improved or debased, but it cannot be suppressed.

It is true that our Lord and Saviour has told us that there are times and circumstances when we shall have to appear before Him, deprived of a right eye, or maimed in a right hand. But He surely would wish us to keep them if we can.

Æstheticism, imagination, the sense of symbolism (to view Ceremonial only on the side of man),

are much too important things to be suppressed; if they are not consecrated they will become degraded and used for the most deadly purpose; while the God of beauty can never repel those who earnestly seek to consecrate the beautiful to His service, and to turn what may become the sensual into the spiritual.

CHAPTER XI

STEPS TO THE ALTAR

'Al Padre, al Figlio, allo Spirito Santo
Cominciò, Gloria, tutto il Paradiso,
Sì che m'inebbriava il dolce canto.
Ciò ch' io vedeva, mi sembiava un riso
Dell' universo: per che mia ebbrezza
Entrava per l'udire e per lo viso.
O gioia! O ineffabile allegrezza!
O vita intera d'amore e di pace!
O, senza brama, sicura ricchezza!'

When we remember the intense care and devotion which has been lavished on the structure and composition of the divine Liturgy, we are prepared to find that our own simple version of it has not only an interest to the antiquarian and the ecclesiologist, but has also its own appeal to make to the devout Communicant who wishes to approach God acceptably with godly fear.

The very words and structure of the service seem to meet those who crave some further help, who may seem to say, as Moses said of old, 'We know not with what we must serve the Lord, until we come thither.'[1] An endeavour therefore will be made in

[1] Exodus x. 26.

this chapter to show the spiritual significance of that service in which the Christian habitually takes his part, and to show how it may help us to realise the solemn nature of divine worship, and the demands which it makes upon the worshippers.

We assemble to make our Communion, each of us clothed in the wedding garment which Christ Himself has provided, and without which we may not presume to enter the Presence. The actual service has been preceded by the careful preparation of the individual; he has come with a due recognition of his own unworthiness, as one whom Christ has pardoned and invited; he is resolute in his purpose and firm in his faith, with an earnest longing to receive Him Whom his soul desires to love, Who has summoned him to His Presence.

At first we find ourselves, as it were, in the outer courts in the vestibule of the Palace, waiting for him who is to be our spokesman, our leader, in the great act of religious worship on which we have entered. We listen while he puts up to God at the very threshold the prayer which contains in brief all that we wish to ask, and which signifies the fullness of all that we desire to offer. God is in Heaven, and we upon earth, therefore our words must be few. The service we are engaged in has for its main object the honour and glory of God. It is our bounden duty and service. We are praying Him to accomplish the number of His elect and to hasten His kingdom, that so His will may be carried

out in all the world, and that God may be all in all. We are coming to seek our daily super-substantial bread; we beseech Him to forgive us our sins, and to help us, to whom much has been forgiven, ourselves to be forgiving. We are going to bring before Him our manifold temptations, and to beseech Him not to allow us to be tempted above that we are able, but to deliver us from the malice and fraud of the Devil by His own Almighty power. This is in sum the petition which the whole service will raise in our name before the throne of God. And the priest as he leads us on prays for himself and us, that we may be cleansed from the dust of travel and the stains of the world, and be enabled to come holy and clean, as God would have us, to such a Heavenly Feast.

The penitential opening which follows is of great importance, and should on no account be slighted or omitted. The ten commandments, as once given in the terrors of Sinai, are read to us one by one. Our thoughts are thus carried back to our self-examination and confession, our previous amendment, and our imperfect penitence. Each one is able as he remembers the sin which does so easily beset him to ask for special aid in the long conflict. Each can pray for the world around him, that these sins may become less flagrant, and that God's law may be honoured and glorified.

We then pass on into another anteroom leading into the Presence. Here, in the spirit of patriotism,

which God seems to have encouraged in the hearts of His people Israel, we pray for the King, that in the peace of the city where we dwell we may have peace;[1] and in the spirit of reverence for him who is the fount of law and order, to whom we look for the blessing of good government. Here at once we are challenged, as it were—What is thy petition? For what dost thou make request? And through our representative we make our specific prayer, in the collect for the day, that prayer of the collected Church, where the two or three are gathered together in God's name; now it is for deliverance from our enemies, now for peace, for purity, for grace, now for godliness, for the Holy Spirit, for guidance, for love. And at this point we are met by an encouragement, we receive a message from the steward of God's bounties, clothed in the language of some inspired Epistle, prophetic or other writing. As the cold of snow in the time of harvest, so is a faithful messenger to them that send him.'[2] After which we all stand up to receive a message from the throne. The Holy Gospel is read amid every sign of respect and honour. This has ever been one of the most important points in the Liturgy where we strive to realise the great privilege which we possess in the gospel of life, 'As cold waters to a thirsty soul, so is good news from a far country.'[3] And the Gospel is good news which we eagerly welcome, which beckons us on to throw ourselves

[1] Jer. xxix. 7. [2] Prov. xxv. 13. [3] Prov. xxv. 25.

on the mercy of God and to receive those things which we so sorely need for the battle of life. This is followed by a profession of faith in God, Whom we are approaching. 'For he that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him.'[1] We come forward and profess our unswerving confidence in Him Who is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. And we make this profession of faith in words which carry on their face the signs of past conflict and past victories. They link us back to the ages of the champions of the Church who boldly contended for the faith which was once delivered unto the Saints. In a day of reproach and blasphemy, when the most solemn truths are assailed or disputed, it is a comfort to throw oneself confidently on the strong words of absolute faith such as these. The Creed can never be a dry recital of abstract dogma, but it is ever a living protestation of unalterable fidelity in the contented repose of the soul on those truths which are its life and support—

'Firmly I believe and truly
God is three, and God is one;
And I next acknowledge duly
Manhood taken by the Son.
And I trust and hope most fully
In that Manhood crucified:
And each thought and deed unruly
Do to death, as He has died.

[1] Heb. xi. 6.

Simply to His grace and wholly
Light and life and strength belong,
And I love, supremely, solely,
Him the holy, Him the strong.'[1]

Then having gained confidence, we are beckoned on and are allowed to make an offering to God. 'When they had opened their treasures, they presented unto Him gifts.'[2] These are of two kinds. First we offer to Him of our substance, as God has blessed us. And it is well that we should remember the religious nature of almsgiving. It takes its place in the Sermon on the Mount with such obvious duties as prayer and fasting, and must be ranked among the privileges as well as the duties of life. The money so offered is set apart for God's poor or for other charitable purposes, but no doubt at this place and in this connection is represented in a very solemn way the contribution of the laity to the public act of divine worship. For it is at this point that an oblation is made of bread and wine for the purposes of the service, theoretically out of the money thus collected for the purpose. And to this day in the Rite of S. Ambrose at Milan, the offering by the people is very strikingly preserved. Out of this oblation of the people the priest selects the oblation which he deems sufficient to become later, on consecration, the true oblation of the service which is identified with the one

[1] Newman, *Dream of Gerontius*, § 1.
[2] S. Matt. ii. 11.

oblation and satisfaction of Calvary as pleaded in the blood of sprinkling before the Eternal Throne. The Lamb is being brought to the temple for the sacrifice, and associated with His merits we pour out our supplication to God, for all His Church, militant here on earth, not unmindful let us hope of the greater division of the Church which has passed within the veil. For every Liturgy which we possess hastens to fulfil this duty of Christian piety in feeling that here at all events, before the approach to the throne, there is no barrier or division between the living on earth and the living departed. 'For all live unto Him.'[1]

Here we seem to be arrested for the moment. When the King comes in to see the guests, we must see to it that no one is there who has not on a wedding garment. And therefore we are bidden once more to remember our sins. With exhortation searching and strong we are told to cast away anything that may defile or make us unworthy of the Presence. No perfunctory self-examination is sufficient, the repentance must be true and earnest. The resolution to lead a new life must be stedfast. There must be nothing which is contrary to charity clinging to us, nothing which savours of formality or irresolution. Faith is necessary, and the comfort of God's promise is sure, but first there must be another confession. And so in the name of all those who are minded to receive the Holy Com-

[1] S. Luke xx. 38.

munion an earnest confession is made. The congregation is presumably in earnest; presumably each has examined himself, made confession, exercised contrition, obtained forgiveness and promised amendment. And yet the confession is much more than a confession of sinfulness, it is a general opposed to a particular confession of sins, whose burden becomes more intolerable in view of the nearer presence of God. There is no desire to hide anything from the all-seeing eye of the great Judge. Mercy and pardon in view of the past, peace in view of the present, and newness of life for the future, so runs the cry for pardon from the heart which loathes itself, as one who if pardoned must yet feel that he has sinned. Then, as on the first Maundy Thursday, we see by the eye of faith Jesus rise from supper. He lays aside His garments, and takes a towel and girds Himself. He pours water into a bason, and begins to wash His disciples' feet and to wipe them with the towel wherewith He is girded. Jesus comes to wash the feet of those who are already bathed. A S. Peter may say, 'Thou shalt never wash my feet.' In our ignorance of His purpose we may say this Absolution is needless. Why its solemn words, 'pardon and deliver you from all your sins; confirm and strengthen you in all goodness; and bring you to everlasting life'? But Jesus still says, 'If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with Me.' It is still true, 'He that is washed needeth not save to wash

his feet';[1] but yet the feet must be washed even of the most penitent, the sprinkling of Absolution must be applied to those who feel the fullness of His pardon, 'that those things may please Him which we do at this present,' and that we may be 'cleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary.'[2]

The penitent thus absolved is comforted, in view of the grief which must remain even for forgiven sin, and in view of the general unworthiness which attaches even to the most saintly life, by words of comfort read out of Holy Scripture. S. Matthew and S. John give us our Lord's own words of welcome to the penitent, and S. Paul and S. John the experience of their own heart of the reality and blessedness of forgiveness in Christ. And here the first division of the service ends: here we leave, as it were, ourselves and our sins. And it is well to remember sometimes that to dwell on our sins too much may become a distrust of God's forgiving power, and be a hindrance rather than a help. When we have once grasped what a miserable thing in God's sight both our righteousness and repentance must be, and that we are only accepted in and for the merits of Jesus Christ, we should press on more towards perfection, not be for ever groping to find out sins, but cheerfully welcoming any sign of progress, and recognising one of God's gifts to us in the improvement which we are able to notice. Scrupulosity is a danger very incident to good

[1] See S. John xiii. 1-17. [2] 2 Chron. xxx. 19.

people, and it would be wrong in view of what God has done and promised to us, even in the particular approach to His presence which we are now making, to refuse to be comforted and so to play into the hands of our adversary the Devil, who is ever seeking to make the heart of the righteous sad, by objecting to them a complicity with sinful desires, even where he has failed to set up the sin.

We now pass into the antechamber of the throne. The passage is a striking one from the region of human penitence into the blaze of the angelic song and the splendour of the Heavenly Court. It is an effort which must be earnestly faced on our part. 'Lift up your hearts' is an invitation to advance, which has to be answered by a ready response, 'We lift them up unto the Lord.' In these words, as far back as the third century certainly, and probably in the days of the Apostles themselves, the faithful have entered into the more solemn part of the Liturgy. And it is strange to find how much more difficult it is to enter into the joy of the Lord than to beseech Him for His clemency, to praise than to pray, to rejoice than to sorrow. 'Let us give thanks unto our Lord God,' must ever provoke the answer, 'It is meet and right so to do.' But we cannot say also with honesty and truth that it is easy for our human nature so to do.

And yet this thanksgiving is one of the most characteristic phases of that service whose very name is Eucharist. We go back to wellnigh the

earliest description of the Christian Liturgy extant, and Justin Martyr tells us of the long thanksgiving offered by the presiding celebrant.[1] Our Lord Himself gave thanks, before He brake and gave. And so here the priest for us, and we with him, says, 'It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto Thee, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God': the offering here and always in the Liturgy being to the Father, by Jesus Christ and with Jesus Christ in the unity of the Holy Ghost.

And as if the language of penitence was more suited to our life than the language of praise, we ask for the help of the angels, or rather we associate ourselves with the angelic choir, and 'with angels and archangels, and with all the company of Heaven, we laud and magnify [God's] glorious Name; evermore praising [Him], and saying, Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of hosts, Heaven and earth are full of Thy glory: glory be to Thee, O Lord most high.'

We are reminded at once of Isaiah,[2] at that moment when he was permitted to see a vision of God and join with angels in their worship. He shows us what is the attitude of beings who see God, and what should be the attitude of those who should be straining after the same vision. Everything is veiled and wrapped in mystery; the attempt

[1] *Apol.*, i. ch. 65, 67. [2] Isaiah vi.

by searching to find out God, and to define with subtilty His awful Nature, is foredoomed to failure. 'Verily Thou art a God that hidest Thyself, O God of Israel, the Saviour.'[1] And the sanctity of God exacts a corresponding reverence from His worshippers. The face of the seraphs is veiled with two wings, for they fear to gaze upon God. Their feet are veiled with two wings, for they fear the gaze of God even upon their sinless ways and feet which run ever in the way of God's commandments; and with two more wings they fly, an effort which must always be demanded from those who would serve God acceptably and render to Him the homage of their whole being. It is only possible for man also thus to join in the *Sanctus* of the courts of Heaven. Our way hitherto has been barred with awe, and hedged in with reverence. The very structure of the church, as we have seen, with its barriers, screens, ascents, and reserve, suggests the two wings which cover the face. The service itself has invited and repelled, encouraged and warned: the progress has been marked with penitence and humble submission. And so no less there has been the constant recall, in a voice which says to us, 'Whence comest thou?' 'Be watchful, and strengthen the things which remain, that are ready to die: for I have not found thy works perfect before God.'[2] The sense of unworthiness and contrition, the longing for penitence, have been to us as the two wings of godly

[1] Isaiah xlv. 15. [2] Rev. iii. 2.

sorrow which have covered our erring ways. And the effort which we make, the earnest lifting up of our hearts, the association with the worship of Heaven, become to us the two wings which keep us poised and attentive, hearkening what the Lord God will say concerning us, and ready to follow the guidance of His eye.

Certainly the angels must wonder at us who thus crave to associate ourselves with their devotion. It must be as when a man enters a picture-gallery full of masterpieces of art, and has neither eyes to see nor heart to appreciate the beauty spread out before him, and those whose admiration is kindled by the glory of form and colour around them, wonder at his denseness and want of sympathy. Or as when in a concert of music a man sits unmoved and inattentive to the sweet sounds poured forth, and men wonder at the deprivation which he is suffering, who has no ear to hear the exquisite harmony. So the angels must wonder at us, cold and unsympathetic in the presence of so much beauty, discordant and out of harmony with the worship which we aspire to share.

And therefore, as if the feeling were strong upon us that we are now as high as we are permitted to go, we kneel down and say with heartfelt abasement, 'Lord, we are not worthy.' More humble even than the Syro-Phœnician woman of old, we are unable to claim the very crumbs which fall from the Master's table. Nevertheless, because we are poor and needy

we come to the Lord of Heaven and earth ; because we are sick we come to the Good Physician, and we ask that that fountain of love may be opened to us, which alone can cleanse us body and soul, and that we may receive not only the Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood, but also the virtue and benefits of that Sacrament, and that not unto damnation but unto remission of sins, and for the preservation of our soul and body to everlasting life. Here we find ourselves at the foot of the Altar Throne. There opens up before us the vision of the Altar in Heaven. There in the midst of the throne, and of the four living creatures, and in the midst of the elders, stands a Lamb as it had been slain,[1] offering Himself with the precious blood of sprinkling unto God : and here on earth is the altar with its spotless linen clean and white, its torches of fire, its flowers and ornaments all ready prepared, the paten has its bread laid in order, the chalice is prepared, its wine is mingled. We say with Isaac of old, 'Behold the fire and the wood : but where is the lamb for a burnt-offering?' and the answer comes to us, 'God will provide Himself a lamb for a burnt-offering.'[2] We hear the very charter of redemption recited before God, the fact of the one finished Sacrifice of Calvary on which we base all our hopes for redemption. We justify our present action by reference to our Lord's express command that a memorial should

[1] Rev. v. 6. [2] Gen. xxii. 7, 8.

be offered until His coming again. Then we find ourselves mystically once more in the Upper Room at Jerusalem. Once more Jesus Christ is taking the Bread and the Cup, once more He is uttering the dread words, 'This is My Body,' 'This is My Blood.' Once more we hear from His lips His own command, 'Do this as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of Me.' And so our eye sees the King in His beauty, it beholds the land of far distances, in the golden haze of splendour we fail to see the division between Heaven and earth. Now it is the altar in Heaven, now it is the altar on earth, now it is Christ Himself, now it is His unworthy minister, now Christ is here, now by the hands of the holy angel the gifts are carried up to the altar on high in sight of the Divine Majesty, now they return to us in the fullness of their glory.[1] Christ is here to be worshipped and adored. We may constrain Him, saying, 'Abide with us.' Nay, He Himself is saying, 'Make haste, for to-day I must abide at thy house.' And we approach with fear unto the altar, we stretch out our trembling hands, and we receive 'the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ,' 'the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ,' and the angels say in wonder that He is gone to be guest with a man that is a sinner.

Here is a moment of great awe, and immense profit. We can only say, 'Lord, it is good for us to be here.' Not only our own needs stand out

[1] See chap. vii. pp. 158, 159.

before us, but we feel with the Apostle: 'He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?'[1] It is the time when we may plead the Great Sacrifice. The voices of the choir singing, 'O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us, grant us Thy peace,' do but express the inmost needs of our hearts. Our great Moses, on the mountain-top, intercedes with outstretched arms for Israel fighting in the plain with Amalek here below; it is for the adoring Church to stay up those hands, whose supplication and power never waver until the going down of the sun. Here once more in Christ and with Christ we make our supplications for all things needful for us, in this the great oblation of the Eucharist.

It may be questioned here once more, inasmuch as the element of time is excluded in the celebration of the divine Liturgy, whether too much importance is not attached to the moment of consecration. There are those who debate further as to what effects the consecration of the Eucharist, whether the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, so prominent a feature of the old Liturgies, or the words of institution, or both together, or what. There are some who are intentionally vague, to whom we have alluded above,[2] who speak of a presence of Christ in the whole service, and not at any particular moment in the service, and that the consecrated

[1] Rom. viii. 32. [2] See chap. iv. p. 93, chap. ix. p. 195.

elements of the Holy Eucharist are an occasion for adoring Christ rather than a means of doing so. But to go no further than the Book of Common Prayer, a certain prayer is spoken of as 'the Prayer of Consecration'; certain manual acts are performed by the celebrant significant of consecration; and, most important of all, if a new consecration becomes necessary of either species in view of a large number of communicants, the consecration is to be effected not by reading large parts of the service, or indeed the whole of the Consecration Prayer itself, or by simply adding fresh bread and wine, but by the recitation of what are known as the words of institution 'according to the form before prescribed,' which would also carry with it the manual acts. So that the mind and intention of the Church of England would seem to be clear on that point; even if we suppose such invocation as remains to us in the words: 'Hear us, O merciful Father,' and what follows, to linger in its intention for any subsequent reconsecration such as that contemplated above.

We cannot rightly incur any suspicion even of a discontent with the Liturgy we are accustomed to use, if we realise that this act of consecration is the supreme moment towards which all the service hitherto has been tending; that here, like the wise men of old, having tracked the Star, we have come into the Presence where we can but fall down

and worship, and open our treasures of gold, frankincense and myrrh.

At this point, as always in the Prayer Book at the moment of greatest honour and importance, we are bidden to approach God in the Lord's Prayer. We began with this as summarising all the objects of our approach. We present it once more as conveying in its consecrated terms all and more than all we would say, accurately conditioned, rightly balanced, in the petition in which we link hands with those who in probably a ceaseless round night and day are offering this great prayer to God. We then join in a formal prayer of oblation, asking God's gracious acceptance of this sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. We carry with us before Him not only our own needs, but the needs of the whole Church, remembering that those who have passed within the veil are still with us, still part of His Church, and that, perhaps, the living departed are rejoicing in our pleading of the Great Sacrifice as much as or more than we, in a world where many, alas! are dead while they live. The oblation which we make of ourselves is complete. Souls and bodies, both alike, are to be consecrated to God's service as 'a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice.' We pray that the grace of the Sacrament may remain in those who have been fed by it, that our souls may be strengthened and refreshed by the Body and Blood of Christ as our bodies are by the bread and wine; while we feel in our

petition for grace as well as in our cry for pardon that our only hope and plea are in the merits and mediation of Jesus Christ, by Whom and with Whom in the Unity of the Holy Ghost we are enabled to honour and glorify the Father, to Whom the Church offers up this memorial Sacrifice, whose glory tinges every collect and every prayer which ends in Jesus Christ our Lord.

Sometimes as an alternative we offer at this moment a prayer of thankfulness for the benefits bestowed on us in the Communion, expressing our grateful realisation of all that it means to us. But whether here or afterwards, the earnest Communicant should never fail to offer up a heart-felt, formal act of thanksgiving for Communion, the priest in the sacristy or at the altar, the Communicant in church after the blessing. This is one of those practices of devotion which should be formed in us with all the force of a habit. For we would fain avoid hearing once more the sorrowful complaint of that wounded Heart Who said, 'Were there not ten cleansed? but where are the nine? There are not found that returned to give glory to God, save this stranger.'[1]

Still we linger in the light of Christ's presence to sing the Angelic Hymn, which has taken its place here, instead of at the beginning of the service, its more usual position. As we find it, so let us use it as a hymn begun by the angels in the sky, and finished by the Church on earth. It contains for

[1] S. Luke xvii. 17, 18.

us much that we wish to say, words which express at once our adoration and those needs which never vary, cries for mercy, cries for help, cries for peace. But dominating all is the repose which comes to the soul in the simple adoration of God, the rest in the sense of His beauty. 'Upon all the glory shall be a defence.'[1] There are few words so expressive of the *abandon* of praise as these, which, forgetting all our needs and all our blessings, empty themselves out in sheer thankfulness to God for being what He is: 'We give thanks to Thee for Thy great glory.'

We are then dismissed with the peace and blessing. We are so accustomed to these familiar words that we fail to realise the especial grace which comes to us from the blessing of those ordained by God to confer this as well as many other singular marks of His favour. We may realise the importance attached to a blessing by the cunning and deceit exercised by Jacob in the Old Testament in order to wrest the blessing of the firstborn, and the equal importance attached to it by Joseph in the blessing of his own sons. The form of blessing with which Aaron is to bless the people is especially revealed to him by God.[2] And ecclesiastical regulation has confined all ritual blessing to the higher orders of the ministry.

Surely this is one of the moments when the devout Christian especially needs the confirming grace of God. 'Hold that fast which thou hast,

[1] Isa. iv. 5.

[2] Numbers vi. 22, etc.

that no man take thy crown.'[1] When we remember that times of peculiar blessing are followed by peculiar assaults of evil, we know that we shall need all our strength not to be robbed of what we have received. Jesus Christ, fresh from S. John's Baptism and the Heavenly Manifestation, is led by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil.[2] The old life, and the old temptations, wait for us outside the church door, and it would be piteous if we attempted to bring our Lord back into a life in which no effort had been made to receive Him; and yet it is our constant fear that we leave our resolutions and privileges behind us in church, and seem to have no strength to carry them away into our daily life. We need more of the peace of God, which the Church is here ready to bestow upon us, which will bring our lives into 'the tranquillity of order,' more of the strength which comes from a religious enterprise which has not only been prevented by God, and furthered by His continual help, but has also ended in Him, to the glory of His great Name, and to our great and endless comfort.

As we entered on this act of worship, bringing with us what we had been, as affecting what we were, so let us remember the going back into the world. 'I tell you, this man went down to his house,'[3] so runs the parable in completing the pic-

[1] Rev. iii. 11.
[2] S. Luke iv. 1.
[3] S. Luke xviii. 14.

ture of the act of worship of two men viewed on the side of God. As we brought our home-life, with all its failures and sins, into the temple to be purged and sanctified, so we must bring back the strength and peace of the temple into the old life that we may lead it better; we must join the spirit of devotion to the life of activity; there must be the life of restoration which we owe to our friends, even while we would linger longer in the comfort and protection of Christ's presence.[1] The people, who fain would know what they must do with their quickened life, are bidden, as once by the Baptist, to go back and live the old life better. The Publican, if he is a changed man, must go back to his old work, and show what he can do with new principles of action. The soldiers can consecrate their profession, just as much as the profession can ruin the soldier.[2] It is the joy and boast of Christianity that it is a working religion, which needs no unnatural seclusion for its development. Men emerged from their Eucharist to be 'saints in Cæsar's household.' And every man is more of a man, and every home is brighter, because of the extension of the Incarnation which is conveyed to us in this Holy Sacrament.

Here once more He fills the hungry with good things, and sends the rich empty away. The great public work of the Eucharist, which we have been considering in its orderly and stately approach,

[1] S. Mark v. 18, 19. [2] S. Luke iii. 10-14.

will ever leave behind it some of that Christian refinement which belongs to those who are often at court, the court of the King of Kings. They will know something of 'the manner of the God of the land.'[1] Men will take 'knowledge of them, that they have been with Jesus.'[2] Every devout Communicant is a fresh rallying-point, where men suspect treachery and failure in the confusion and error of the way. 'They that fear Thee will be glad when they see me: because I have put my trust in Thy word.'[3]

[1] 2 Kings xvii. 27.
[2] Acts iv. 13.
[3] Psalm cxix. 74.

CHAPTER XII

THE EUCHARIST AND HUMAN LIFE

'Ad imperium Domini proficiscebantur et ad imperium Illius figebant tabernaculum ; cunctis diebus, quibus stabat nubes super tabernaculum, manebant in eodem loco . . . ad imperium Domini erigebant tentoria et ad imperium Illius deponebant.'

'Adesto, Domine, supplicationibus nostris et viam famulorum Tuorum in salutis Tuæ prosperitate dispone, ut inter omnes viæ et vitæ hujus varietates Tuo semper protegantur auxilio, per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.'

We have tried to glance now at the greatness of the Eucharistic Mystery, which is at once the extension of the Incarnation and the union of earth and heaven in the mystic pleading of the one Sacrifice. It remains only to see the pervading influence of this Sacrament of life in the wanderings and vicissitudes of our earthly journey, in all times of our tribulation, in all times of our wealth, the consolation of our sorrows, the uplifting of our joys, the perfecting of our strength. The angel's sword is lowered, and at last man may approach, may put forth his hand and take of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever. 'Your fathers did eat manna in

the wilderness and are dead : he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever.'[1]

It is well for us to realise this characteristic of life which belongs to the Blessed Sacrament, while we are called upon here to die daily. This daily existence of ours slips from us as we pass along ; we never continue in one stay. Friends walk at our side, and then are lost to view. Day succeeds day, each with its golden store, which we sometimes try to gather, but more often miss. They come and go, and we cannot recall them. At one time we are in sunshine, at another in darkness. At one moment the cloud broods over the tabernacle, and we are at rest ; at another it is taken up, and God calls us forward. Our friends preach detachment; they impress upon us that here we have no continuing city, that we and all around us are changing and shifting until life itself falls away from its earthly environment, and naked we go as naked we came. We carry nothing away with us when we die. And the heart shrinks within itself, we long for 'the things that remain'; attachment is a doctrine which appeals to us more than detachment, as our frail, human heart feels out after some stay and support. And here it is that we feel in the Sacramental life we are laying hold of that which transcends the things of this earth. Here is something which will survive all change, something which will last for ever. For the bliss of heaven

[1] S. John vi. 58.

which we long for, and the joy which we are bidden to expect, are union with Christ. 'Then shall I know even as also I am known.'[1] 'When He shall appear, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is.'[2] And this bliss may begin here, for 'Blessed are they which are called unto the marriage supper of the Lamb.'[3] In the midst of our daily struggles, where our Eucharists are too often but the *Te Deum* on the field of battle, here is One Who never changes, Who comes to us in our shattered hopes and maimed endeavour, 'Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever,'[4] Who will strengthen us here as He will welcome us there, as He whispers to the battered combatant victorious at the last, 'I girded thee, though thou hast not known Me.'[5]

Hence, it has been the wisdom of the Church to associate the Holy Eucharist closely with the varying incidents of human life, to consecrate its crises, and to unify its changes with this life-giving power.

Among many things which we have lost, in the fear of false doctrine or practice, which pressed the English Reformers so often into entire abolition rather than particular reform, there stands out conspicuously the prominence assigned to the Holy Eucharist in the different undertakings of life, whether grave or gay. Even the Sunday festival, the day of the Lord, in defiance of all Christian

[1] 1 Cor. xiii. 12. [2] 1 S. John iii. 2. [3] Rev. xix. 9.
[4] Heb. xiii. 8. [5] Isa. xlv. 5.

tradition, may be, and in many places is, observed without its Eucharist. The daily divine office, beautiful as it is, while associating with itself the laity, contrived to supersede the daily Eucharist. The Nuptial Eucharist is only faintly recognised by a half-hearted rubric at the end of the service. The Burial Service knows nothing of it at all. The Churchman is left to himself in so many things which have now become our common custom, birthday anniversaries, times of public thanksgiving or humiliation, devotional gatherings, synods, church dedication, and the like. It was inevitable that, in a time of revived activity, such as the present, it should be necessary largely to supplement the Book of Common Prayer, to fall back on the *Jus Liturgicum* of the bishop. And so it has come about that among the many changes which religious public opinion has forced upon us, the revival of the Holy Eucharist, as the prominent expression both of joy and anxiety, should have become interwoven with the new life and vigour of the Church. It is by Christ and with Christ in the mystic pleading of the precious Blood that we can most effectually intercede. It is in the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving that we can best express our joy. And so the Sunday maimed of its Eucharist has become rarer. The daily public recitation of the divine office has been in more numerous cases supplemented by the daily Eucharist. Musical composers have found themselves called

upon for festival and penitential settings of this divine Liturgy. Few anniversaries are looked upon as complete without their Eucharist, and the great service has been brought back, or is being brought back, by the hearts of the people to occupy its rightful position in the national life.

But there are three especial occasions in which the Holy Eucharist seems to stand out with peculiar significance, and to possess a deep and abiding blessing, which merit perhaps some fuller appreciation on our part. The rubric which runs, 'It is convenient that the new-married persons should receive the Holy Communion at the time of their marriage, or at the first opportunity after their marriage,' may be a wise limitation of ancient custom in view of the many unworthy and unfit persons who enter lightly into that Holy Estate, but at the same time, for the Christian man and woman, for whom the Church must primarily provide, there is no question as to the importance of the Nuptial Eucharist. Even to the ordinary man, the 'Form of solemnization of Matrimony' as it stands in the Prayer Book, is one of no common solemnity. There is a seriousness about its utterances, mingled with tenderness and anxiety. It speaks of fatherhood and motherhood, and of the great mystery of life; but also of the irrevocable, of the prudence which faces possibilities, of the love which must learn to share adversity as well as prosperity with the beloved, and must banish

all fickleness and know no change. It speaks as to those who are entering on a state, no contract merely revocable at will, but a state entered on by contract which cannot be cancelled. Separation there may be in the vicissitudes of life, but dissolution, never. It speaks to those who are about to found a family, if it be God's will, a family which in God's good Providence is one of the very bulwarks of society, and part of the nation's strength. It is solemn, because it is a Sacrament of the Church, in which our minds are lifted up above the outward circumstances, and the lighter and more unworthy considerations to the inner meaning of marriage, instituted by God in Eden in the time of man's innocency, blessed by Him at Cana of Galilee, and sanctioned by the precepts and limitations of His own divine utterances.

How important it is then that a union so momentous, involving issues so important, should be cemented by the sacramental indwelling of Christ Himself. If all Communicants are members one of another, how much more should the man and woman made one in Holy Matrimony be made one in the indwelling Presence of Christ through His divine Sacrament.

And it is necessary to remember that the Sacrament of marriage is not in itself connected with the Church and her blessing. It is a sacrament which the man and the woman who consent to live

together by a solemn vow of union themselves accomplish. The function of the Church is first of all to be the accredited and religious witness of the vow, and then by blessing, prayer, and Eucharist to give to the newly married pair the power to realise in their lives that life of unity in diversity which symbolises even the mystical union of Christ with His Church. And the fact that so many fail in realising this shows how difficult is the attainment. And therefore Christ's special blessing and special presence are invited that the full spiritual value of the union may be received. The man and the woman who are joined together in Holy Matrimony enter, did they but know it, on a fuller life, a life in which each contributes to a more perfect completeness, one being the complement of the other. And to this end each has to lose self, the more fully to gain it. There must be the self-denial which is always so uncongenial to our nature, as a preliminary to a richer blessing. And Christ alone will help in dark and selfish hours to a more full realisation of this.

Few who talk loosely about the self-denial of the celibate life, great and holy as it is when enterprised for the love of God, realise the constant call to self-effacement and discipline which there may be in the married life, and how many unhappy homes are caused by the want of it. Habitually to live for another, as far as is compatible with life's duties, requires a very special

grace which God alone can give. 'Men who have no tie on them, who have no call on their daily sympathy and tenderness, who have no one's comfort to consult, who can move about as they please, and indulge the love of vanity and the restless humours which are so congenial to the minds of most men, are very unfavourably situated for obtaining that heavenly gift, which is described in our Liturgy as being "the very bond of peace and of all virtues." On the other hand, I cannot fancy any state of life more favourable for the exercise of high Christian principles, and the matured and refined Christian spirit (that is, where the parties really seek to do their duty), than that of persons who differ in taste and general character being obliged by circumstances to live together, and mutually to accommodate to each other their respective wishes and pursuits—and this is one among the many providential benefits (to those who will receive them) arising out of the Holy Estate of Matrimony, which not only calls out the tenderest and gentlest feelings of our nature, but, where persons do their duty, must be in various ways more or less a state of self-denial.'[1]

We can see how much the grace of God is needed to help them each to live for the other in unselfishness, and both for the home.

'Each man's chimney is his Golden Milestone;
Is the central point from which he measures
Every distance,

[1] Newman, *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. ii. p. 58.

Through the gateway of the world around him.
In his farthest wanderings he still sees it ;
Hears the talking flame, the answering night-wind,
As he heard them
When he sat with those who were, but are not.'

Or like the lark—

'Type of the wise who soar but never roam ;
True to the kindred points of Heaven and Home.'

And the Nuptial Eucharist is not merely a barrier negatively to evil, it helps to a fuller realisation of the sacramental blessings which Marriage contains in its sacred fellowship. The married life is designed to be a life in which the one is the complement of the other, each supplying that in which the other is deficient, in order to attain to a fuller life. So the husband may elevate the wife to do her duties with earnest purpose, and the wife may urge her husband to ever higher conceptions of his life's work, set him free for his duties and encourage him. The path of experience is strewn with tragedies in the spoiled and ruined lives of those who have failed to attain to this grace; where the husband has neglected the wife and refused to share with her a higher life, or where the wife has thought of herself only as a rival to her husband in making it her aim to snatch at his peculiar functions, rather than as a complement to minister to him of her own. There have been many Delilahs who have pulled down, betrayed, and ruined Samsons, who have thought nothing of their divine mission, and have failed to help them to direct their God-given strength : always

the pulling down, the depressing to a low level of mediocre equality, which jealousy prefers, rather than the lifting up ever higher and higher, by sympathy, encouragement, and, if need be, self-effacement.

Browning has expressed the pathos of the married life which lacks its sympathetic completeness in the masterly lines in which he depicts the painter straining after the ideals which open up to him in his God-given art, and yet ever being drawn back by the wife who would turn all his inspiration into base gold to gratify her pleasures. With no help to give, no sympathy or inspiration, only the perpetual drag down of the sordid soul, craving to satisfy a greedy longing, in a selfishness which tends to destroy even the monetary value of the painter's genius.

> 'Had I been two, another and myself,
> Our head would have o'erlooked the world!
> . . . . .
> Had you enjoined them on me, given me soul,
> We might have risen to Rafael, I and you.'[1]

And yet it is grace, not nature, which enables man or woman thus to realise the unity of the double life: the man, like S. Joseph, to be the guardian and protector of the favoured virgin soul, the woman, like 'the other Mary' of Scripture, to be content to be an influence, a life merged in others, herself unknown, as she appears as 'the wife of Cleophas' or the mother of James and Joses, the wife of a good man, the mother of noble sons.

[1] Browning, *Andrea del Sarto.*

In view of the possibilities of good and evil, of joy or pain, the Church does well to make the Nuptial Eucharist an integral part of the sacramental rite of Marriage. There is the better and the worse, the richer and the poorer, sickness as well as health. There are very peculiar blessings to win, there are very pressing dangers which have to be met.

Often and often in the happiest married life will one or the other find the blessing of having asked Him to the marriage, Who can turn the water of disappointment into the wine of joy. Often and often there will arise the need of Him. 'Lord, if Thou hadst been here' he 'had not died.' Often and often it is He alone Who can provide in the desolation of the ruined home, as He calls from the Cross, 'Woman, behold thy son'; to the disciple, 'Behold thy mother.' If He is at our side we can turn to Him in the roughest storm and say, 'Good Jesu, Who didst say to the raging waters, "Peace, be still," Who didst stretch forth Thine hand to Peter, when beginning to sink; if Thou allow this tumult to last, at least uphold me; if I walk through the waters, let me walk with Thee. And let Thy presence hush me, still me, make a great calm within me, that may be wholly hushed in myself, wholly reflect Thee.'[1]

But, again, there is an occasion even more solemn than Holy Matrimony with which a special celebra-

[1] Attributed to Dr. Pusey.

tion of the Holy Communion has been associated from the earliest days. The Funeral Eucharist, and the Eucharist for the departed, on certain occasions, appeal to the most solemn instincts of the heart, which refuses to believe in a lifeless sleep of the departed souls, and is not allowed to believe in their immediate transference to the final glories of heaven or the final woes of hell. There is a want which makes itself more and more felt in the Burial Service provided in the Prayer Book. It is almost entirely directed to the consolation or present and future benefit of the survivors, while there is hardly a prayer, which exceeds a pious hope, for the soul which has so lately gone forth to stand before its Maker. Here is one of the worst examples of hurried and panic legislation. The first Reformed Prayer Book, in 1549, provided as a matter of course a special celebration to be used at funerals. The following is the collect, which we recognise as practically identical with that in use at the present day, and which throws light upon one of the few timid prayers for the departed which are officially left to us:—

'O merciful God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Who is the resurrection and the life: in Whom whosoever believeth shall live though he die; and whosoever liveth, and believeth in Him, shall not die eternally: Who also hath taught us (by His holy Apostle Paul) not to be sorry as men without hope for them that sleep in Him: we

meekly beseech Thee (O Father) to raise us from the death of sin, unto the life of righteousness, that when we shall depart this life, we may sleep in Him (as our hope is this our brother doth), and at the general resurrection in the last day, *both we and this our brother departed*, receiving again our bodies and rising again in Thy most gracious favour; may with all Thine elect Saints, obtain eternal joy—grant this,' etc. The words in italics may surely give the explanation of the phrase as it now stands—'That we, *with all* those that are departed in the true faith of Thy holy Name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in Thy eternal and everlasting glory; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen,' and associate us in prayers with the faithful departed.

Any one who will take the trouble to read this Office of the first book together with the intercessions in the canon of the Communion Service, will see how free and ungrudging, how primitive and touching, were the intercessions for the departed. It was only when the Prayer Book of 1552 was imposed upon the Church of England that the funeral celebration disappeared from the service, and all mention of the dead whatever, either in prayer or thanksgiving, was withdrawn from the Prayer for the Church in the Communion Service, although the two collects in the Burial Service still contained a memorial of them. The neglect of the departed is a serious evil for any nation, for

it reacts on the general feeling and character of the time. It is not a little sad to notice the utter disregard for the famous dead who were buried in S. Paul's, as shown in the want of care for the monuments which were left, and in the omission to perpetuate in any way their memories. It is a distinct loss to a nation to be robbed of its heroes, it is a loss to every Christian soul to be cut off from a sensible Communion with the living departed. But we feel that this is not all; must it not be true that we are in some way depriving the departed of their rights, if we cease to pray for them? They have but gone into another room, and we who base our hopes on immortality are so earth-bound, that we are unable to follow with our prayers those whom we have associated with ourselves in prayer all our lives, as if they were really dead, and all connection with them was severed.

What is there to account for this strange attitude on the part of those who believe in the life of the world to come? There are two causes which have contributed to bring it about. The one is the fear of Rome and of the mediæval doctrine of Purgatory; the other is the practical disbelief in the intermediate state. It is not, however, a little remarkable to notice the revulsion of feeling which has come over English Churchmen of late years with reference to the practice of prayers for the dead. It may be well to quote, in this connection, as the last contemporary utterance on this subject,

the words of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline.[1]

'The Church of England has never formally condemned prayers for the dead, as distinguished from their public use in her services. Divines of the Church have again and again protested against the necessity such as is, by Roman Catholic writers, constantly assumed to exist between the doctrine of Purgatory and prayers for the departed. Prayers for the rest and refreshment of the souls of the faithful departed are to be found in the earliest extant form of the most ancient liturgies; and they are admitted to have been offered before those liturgies were compiled. The spread of a belief that in the intermediate state the souls of the departed were subjected to a process of punishment and purification in Purgatory, and therefore were in pain, altered the character of prayers for the dead, and made them to a large extent supplications for the delivery of the souls of the departed from suffering.'

The Latin satirist has told us that if we drive out nature with a pitchfork, it will yet always come back again. Human instinct cannot be repressed in the long-run any more than legislation is possible which is far ahead of public opinion. Every one, some more, some less, has an interest in the faithful departed, and it is a subject on

[1] *Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline*, 1906, p. 45.

which we can ill bear any intrusion. And the present demand for memorial services and the strange rite known as 'the Dead March in *Saul*,' are signs that this spring which has been so long driven down into the earth of a hard materialism is beginning to break up through the ground. Here and there through the darkest times there have been little trickling rills of devotion, in the case of individuals, to the memory of the departed. And surely the time has now almost come when their memorial will take its rightful liturgical position. It is difficult to believe that our method in so many cases of celebrating funerals can be right. The coffin without its pall, the profusion of flowers, the hymns identifying the departed with the saints—all seem designed to make us forget the awful solemnity of death; and further, that it is the penalty of sin; while we all, even the most saintly, pass to judgment and to the ordeal of that day when the righteous scarcely are saved. It is but another example of extravagant reaction from the Pagan gloom of the eighteenth century, but it is desirable that the matter should be readjusted in accordance with the solemnity and holy fear of the ancient Church. A well-known bishop, who has only gone from us a few years ago, said: 'When all fear of superstition has passed away, the use of prayers for the dead will be as common as the use of images in church, now that the fear of idolatry has passed away.'

Aristotle of old with his keen intelligence saw that it was a very unkindly thing[1] to suppose that the dead have no relations to the living. In repressing feelings of this kind we are repressing an instinct of humanity. This can only be done at a great loss. We must regulate it, it may be, but we cannot repress it. In the letters of one of our princesses she records, after the loss of her youngest boy, that the eldest 'always prays for Frittie.' It is the testimony of the soul 'naturally Christian,' in the instinct of a child unterrified by ecclesiastical history and innocent of controversy. Many are asking with anxiety, 'May I pray for my departed friends?' Others are saying, 'I feel that my dear ones ought rather to be praying for me; what need have they of me? what can I do for them? what can I ask for them?' While there is a sort of fear lest, beginning with a simple prayer, all unwittingly they should open the door of a furnace of purgatory and disturb a vision of rest with an aggravation of human torment and disquiet. It must be remembered, however, that to ignore, as we so often do, the intermediate state is, as is always the case in anything which damages proportion, to bring about a fertile crop of error, which has a disastrous effect on our belief. Think of the bitter distress which has been caused by the crude belief that we pass at once on death into our perfect consummation of bliss or into its dread alternative. On the one

[1] Aristotle, *Ethics*, i., chap. 11, λίαν ἄφιλον.

hand, the simpler people think that death itself is a transforming furnace in which the greatest sinner sloughs off his foul nature of sin and emerges an angel, that is, becomes a member of a different order of beings altogether; or else, seeing that the great majority of their acquaintance die not good enough for Heaven or bad enough for Hell, they bring themselves to believe that the plain statements of our Blessed Lord can be cleared away, and that somehow and somewhere all, even the greatest sinners, will enter into a state of eternal bliss. So delicately is the Faith of Christ balanced that it is inevitable that error in any one direction destroys the symmetry of the whole.

When the Church, then, invites her children to offer Eucharists for the departed instead of uttering high-sounding praises of our estimate of their work, what does she rely on? What is the relation of the Christian to the blessed dead? Where shall we conceive the abode of the departed to be?

How easy it is to dogmatise, and how little we know about the subject. Of course very positive statements are made on the subject with very great assurance. And yet, after all, it is well to remember that all that is of obligation *de fide* on a Roman Catholic is the decree of the Council of Trent: 'There is a purgatory, and the souls there detained are helped by the prayers of the faithful, and chiefly by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar.'[1]

[1] Council of Trent, Sess. xxv.

And it would be a fair statement of the faith of the Eastern Church to say that they hold that there is a middle state wherein souls until the last judgment have a foretaste of bliss or of suffering; that therein, through God's mercy, they may be profited by the prayers of the Church and especially by the Holy Sacrifice. And if any ask, Where are the dead? should they not rather be inquiring for a state than for a place? It is generally held that there is a particular judgment at the moment of death, when they that have done good pass into a foretaste of Heaven, and they that are not as yet fit are gradually prepared by the mercy of God for His Presence and for Heaven, while they that have resolutely done ill and have deliberately rejected God's grace are condemned to a foretaste of Hell. Whether this foretaste of Heaven is to be called Paradise or Heaven, how much or how little the blessed enjoy the Beatific Vision, is surely more than we can say. Whether the state of preparation is to be called a Purgatory is more than we can say. Purgatory as we know it has a bad history, and it is difficult to accept even an idea such as this: 'Whoso hath not made on earth full satisfaction for his sins passes after death into Purgatory, where he satisfies Heavenly Justice by enduring temporary punishments, from which, however, the souls of the departed may be delivered by the prayers of the faithful, by the Sacrifice of the Mass on their behalf, and by

Indulgences.' There is a completeness of assurance about a belief like this which is audaciously out of proportion to the scanty data of divine revelation. And it is difficult to see how the following statement is to be regarded as either primitive or catholic: 'Generally speaking and upon the whole, the state of the faithful departed is a state of penal torment, differing from that of hell only in the certainty of future deliverance.' But certainly in a matter where we are left so very free, it is not disquieting, but rather the reverse, to believe that the faithful departed after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh are indeed in joy and felicity, but yet that many, perhaps the majority, are still under the shaping hands of God. He Who has begun a good work in them is performing it until the day of the Lord Jesus. We must lay firm hold of the truth that there is no further probation. If the sinner might then have a fresh chance of grace, the saint also might have a fresh chance of perdition. It would be intolerable to think this. But still, as is so beautifully expressed in *The Dream of Gerontius*, our own imperfect condition in the sight of God may be a very purgatory to us. Here on earth it is only a child who cries out at the healing remedies. The full-grown man welcomes even pain, and gladly submits to it if it means help to him. So while rejecting *ex animo* the abuses of the mediæval doctrine of purgatory, still we may well believe in an intermediate state of preparation,

where God gradually purges away the stain and abolishes the penalty of our sins, which would be a shame and trouble to us in Heaven.

Hence the value of our pleading Christ's great Sacrifice in the funeral oblation for the dead, in accordance with the universal testimony of the ancient liturgies and the custom of the Undivided Church, itself resting on the testimony of Jewish tradition. If it be said that it is not positively ordered in Holy Scripture, neither is the observance of Sunday, although both one and the other apparently are alluded to or appear as customs incidental to Christian life of the early centuries. Most truly, on the one hand, it would be difficult to pray for a release from definite purgatorial penalties, nicely calculated on a debtor and creditor account, helped by a large balance of the merits of the Saints; and, on the other, it would be difficult to send a telegram, as was done a few years ago to the widow of a distinguished man, saying, 'Well done, good and faithful servant.' But there could be nothing else than the sense of peace and humility in uttering a prayer such as this over a departed friend: 'Remember, O Lord, the God of spirits and of all flesh, those whom we have commemorated and whom we have not commemorated, from righteous Abel unto this day. Cause them Thyself to rest there in the land of the living, in Thy kingdom, in the delight of Paradise, in Abraham's bosom; whence have fled pain, sorrow, and

crying, where the light of Thy countenance ever visits and ever shines.' Nothing could hinder the pious prayer: 'Grant them, O Lord, eternal rest, and let light perpetual shine upon them'; or the fervent aspiration: 'May the soul of the faithful, by the mercy of God, rest in peace.'

If it be still said, Could we not trust the King of Paradise to do all this without our intervention? Do the dead need our prayers and Eucharists? Are they not at rest? May we not answer, What, after all, do we pray for in this life, in the formal remembrance of those most near and dear to us? Is not our prayer a going with them, linked by a common memorial, into the Presence of God? Is it not bringing them under the light of that great Sun, which we both gaze upon, whether we are on this side of the ocean of life or on that, and feel as we bask beneath its healing rays that there is nothing hid from the heat thereof?

> 'A power more strong than death is here,
> A mystery which makes all clear;
> Now Faith can those cold hands embrace
> Which from their quiet resting-place
> The Chalice of the Lord pass on:
> Love lives although the loved are gone.'

We are warned back by the unlovely shapes of spiritualism and necromancy from a too curious prying into what has been hidden from us. And it is a sad yet instructive spectacle to see those who have spurned supernatural religion listening to the

scratching of a pencil on a slate, or bending their ear to an unintelligible mysticism as a message from another world.

When our loved ones leave us they do but go into another room, and the door closes. We prayed for them here, we pray for them there. And how deep is the contrast, how separate as the very poles asunder are the pompous ascription of every virtue on the sounding epitaph, which leads us to suppose that Heaven itself would be incomplete without its latest occupant, and the simple brass which has escaped the fury of the iconoclast, the vandalism of the restorer, and the self-assertion of a utilitarian worshipper, which says, 'Stay, O Christian: pray for the soul of the servant of God, who fell asleep in the year of our Lord, on a day known to the Church, who remembers him.'

'We therefore pray Thee, help Thy servant whom Thou hast redeemed with Thy precious Blood.'

There is another occasion specially connected with the administration of the Holy Communion in our daily life, and that is the Communion of the Sick. In the absolute cult of bodily health which is now pursued, so much care is bestowed on alleviation of pain, and perfect tranquillity of mind as regards any disturbing or disquieting thoughts, that it may be doubted whether or not we are beginning to lose our hold of the spiritual aspect and discipline of sickness. Henri Perreyve, in his beautiful book, *La Journée des Malades*, speaks of a time of sick-

ness as a retreat; and indeed it is a time of very special nearness to God, when He is treating the Christian soul in His own way, Himself dictating the mode of taking up the Cross, making sometimes our usual mode of approach to Him impossible. When the tired brain cannot follow the long offices of religion, or indeed pray in the usual and ordered means of approach to God, it requires a very special grace to submit to the 'change of His right hand,' to feel and know that to seek God in His own way, strange though it be, is more acceptable to Him than a vain struggle to approach Him in the way which most commends itself to us, and to which we have been accustomed. It is quite easy to miss the very special grace which might come to us in an illness, and although crucified by the side of Christ, to be like the impenitent thief, an unworthy communicant in the Sacrifice of suffering. Henri Perreyve, in the book mentioned above, reminds us of a saying of Leibnitz that man is a creature made up of time and eternity, and so while we honour the physician with the honour due unto him, and receive his orders delivered for our bodily recovery, as if he stood to us in that respect in the place of God, Who has made him a priest of the healing art, we must never forget the demands of the soul, and the heavenly medicine which God's priest has to deliver. It is said that there are doctors now who discourage the administration of the last rites of the Church, even in the hour of

great danger, as predisposing the patient towards a despair of life, which may hinder his last chance of recovery. But, on the other hand, there are doctors who work cordially and willingly with the priest for the health of the whole man, and who, realising the great truth, 'What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?'[1] feel that after all they are dealing with only half of the man when they provide for the healing of his body.

It has been from the earliest days the practice to administer the Holy Communion to the sick and dying, either with the Sacrament reserved for that purpose, or since 1549 in a private celebration, in the sick man's house, for which a special office has been provided. Mr. Pullan points out that this service was somewhat of the nature of a novelty, although it had been common to say Masses in private houses.[2] The subject of Reservation for the sick has been very prominently brought forward lately; and it may be said, largely owing to the strong representation of its necessity by both clergy and doctors, to be firmly established, under very proper and necessary episcopal restrictions. The Report of the Royal Commission quoted above says, 'There is no question as to the antiquity of reservation for the Communion of those not present

[1] S. Mark viii. 36.

[2] See Pullan, *The Book of Common Prayer*, p. 230, and chap. xiii. generally.

at the celebration in church. It is mentioned as customary even before the middle of the second century (Justin Martyr, *Apol.*, I. lxvii.; Council of Laodicea, xiv.); but from the fourth century onwards, in order to avoid abuses, its use was restricted to the sick (Council of Toledo, xiv.). In the ninth century directions were given that on the altar there should be a pyx or tabernacle where what was called the *viaticum pro infirmis* might be reserved (Leo IV., *Hom.* Mansi., xiv. 891).' Then, after a reference to the later history, we read, 'In the English Prayer Book of 1549, reservation for the sick was expressly permitted, but only for administration on the same day. From 1552 all mention of it disappeared from the Prayer Book. The rubric added in 1662 directs that "if any remain of that which was consecrated, it shall not be carried out of the church, but the priest, and such other of the communicants as he shall then call unto him, shall immediately after the blessing reverently eat and drink the same." The practice of reservation has only been revived in very recent years.'[1]

This is a subject of great importance to many who are chronic invalids, and indeed to every one at some period of his existence. To those who

[1] *Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline*, 1906, p. 39. It is difficult to see how this rubric, evidently inserted for purposes of reverence (see the opening words of the rubric not here quoted), has anything to do with reservation except incidentally.

are not too ill to stand the strain the private celebration is a great comfort, but the injunction imposed in the Prayer Book that 'there shall be three, or two at the least,' to communicate with the sick man, is often a cause of difficulty, especially to the working poor, and has been known to lead to unintentional profanity. It must be remembered also that these private celebrations put a great strain, where there are many sick, on the already overburdened priest, and in times of infection and severe visitation like the cholera, have been found to be impracticable. In the York Manual we find the following :—

'Non nisi mense semel, aliquis communicet æger.'[1]

It would be well that the friends of invalids, and invalids themselves, should be more considerate as to the times, and frequency, with which they apply for their Communion.

Great stress has been laid, with reason, on the last Communion, the *viaticum*, or food for the way in the solemn journey of death. As then it was and is the custom for the last of the unctions to take place, with which the Christian had been anointed for the battle of life ; so this was to be the last strengthening with the divine food, for the last effort. 'The God Which fed me all my life long unto this day'[2] is once more summoned to the aid of the dying man.

[1] P. 52. Surtees Society edition.
[2] Gen. xlviii. 15.

The table is prepared for him in the presence of his enemies, so that while he walks through the valley of the shadow of death he will fear no evil, comforted by the rod and staff of his Saviour.

So much stress has been laid on the importance of this last Communion, that when actual Communion is impossible, not only has an act of spiritual Communion been advised in these circumstances,[1] but also other symbolical expedients have been resorted to to help those who are thus making a spiritual act.[2] So we read at the battle of Agincourt the King of England 'commanded his priests to abide in prayer and divine supplications, and his heraults in their cotes of armes to attend to their offices. Then every man fell prostrate to the ground, and committed themselves for God, every of them tooke in his mouth a little peece of earth, in remembrance that they were mortall and made of earth, as also in remembrance of the Holy Communion.'[3]

Or again, 'The Englishmen also for their parts were of good comfort, and nothing abashed of the matter, and yet they were both hungrie, wearie, sore trauelled, and vexed with many cold diseases. Howbeit reconciling themselves with God by hoosel and shift, requiring assistance at His hands, that

[1] See concluding rubrics of The Communion of the Sick.
[2] See Pullan, *The Book of Common Prayer*, p. 236.
[3] Stow, *Annales*, ed. 1631, p. 349.

is the only giuer of victorie, they determined rather to die, than to yield, or flee.'[1]

The words of the rubric in the Prayer Book Office may well be laid to heart. 'Forasmuch as all mortal men be subject to many sudden perils, diseases, and sicknesses, and ever uncertain what time they shall depart out of this life: therefore to the intent they may be always in a readiness to die, whensoever it shall please Almighty God to call them, the Curates shall diligently from time to time (but especially in the time of pestilence, or other infectious sickness) exhort their parishioners to the often receiving of the Holy Communion of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ, when it shall be publicly administered in the Church: that so doing, they may, in case of sudden visitation, have the less cause to be disquieted for the lack of the same.'

So in all times of our tribulation and in all times of our wealth the Lord is with us. He is the cloudy pillar to which we look to lead us in all our journeys. He is the brazen serpent to heal us, as we gaze with the eye of faith upon Him, when we are bitten by the fiery serpents of evil. He is the rock which follows us in our desert journeys with which we may refresh our thirsty souls. He is the Shechinah of glory whose presence fills the tabernacle. He is the manna in the wilderness that a man may eat thereof

[1] Holinshed, *Chronicles*, ed. 1585, p. 552.

and not die. He is the cake of barley which tumbled into the host of the Midianites, which smites and overthrows the tents of our enemies. So the Lord saves us from our enemies and from the hands of all that hate us. It only remains again to emphasise what has been already put forward more than once in this book, that the doctrine of the Blessed Sacrament should not be made a cause of division or party strife. All are agreed as to the solemn and unique nature of this sacred rite. All are agreed that Christ is present in some way remote or near. Let not those who shrink in reverence from their full privileges find fault with those who have taken Christ literally at His word, and have trusted themselves to the long tradition of the Church. Above all, let us banish all charge of idolatry which may not and cannot lie as against any intelligent Eucharistic belief or practice. We cling to the saying of Bishop Andrewes that it is 'Him not it' Whom we worship in the Sacrament. And let us recognise in the deep devotion the loving preparation and profound recollection of those who receive the Sacred Mysteries with a pure heart fervently, that He is known to them in breaking of Bread, even if they have failed to recognise Him in the humble guise of the Traveller who meets them as they walk, and causes their hearts to burn within them as He talks with them by the way.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS AND AUTHORS

Aaron, 255.
Abel, 279.
Abraham, 11, 118, 162, 170, 186, 187, 193, 279.
Absolution, 47, 48, 124, 130, 131-5, 138, 139, 141, 243, 244.
Adam, 43.
Adoration, Eucharistic, 9, 84, 177, 191 and *ff.*, 213, 216, 255.
Æstheticism, 216, 218, 220, 232-4.
Agincourt, 286, 287.
Agnus Dei, the, 251.
Agony of our Lord, the, 110, 180, 232.
Alb, the, 227.
Alms, 142, 205, 241.
Altar, the, 144, 158, 173, 174, 219, 221, 222.
Amalek, 251.
Ambrose, S., 194, 241.
Amice, the, 227.
Ἀνάμνησις, 160-2.
Andrewes, Bishop, 194, 248.
Angels, 198, 246-8.
Antiquity, appeal to, 204-7.
Aristotle, 107, 176, 275.
Articles, Thirty-nine, 53, 59, 61, 64, 76-81, 145, 147, 199, 200.
Ascension, the, 157.
Atonement, Day of, 170.
Atonement, the, 143, 147, 148, 180, 222.
Attachment, 175, 260.
Augustine, S., 24, 25, 80, 90, 98, 152, 194.

Baptism of Christ, 198.
Belief, 15, 93, 251, 252.
Bellarmine, Cardinal, 194.
Bennett, Mr., 192.
Benson, Archbishop, 222.
Berengarius, 63.
Bethesda, 132.
Bethlehem, Council of, 62.
Bevan, 13.
Bible, the, 42.
Blessing, the, 255, 256.
Bodington, Canon, 83.
Body, the, 188, 189, 219.
Browne, Harold, Bishop, 162.
Browning, 268.
Burning Bush, the, 193.

Cain, 153.
Cajetan, Cardinal, 37.
Calvin, 59, 60.
Cana, 264.
Capernaum, the discourse at, 6, 34 and *ff.*, 85, 113.
Capernites, the, 61.
Caroline divines, the, 74.
Carter, Canon, 83.
Catechism, Church, 7, 8, 59, 60, 71, 141, 147, 154, 210.

Celibacy, 265, 266.
Centurion, the, 211.
Cephas, 126.
Chasuble, the, 228.
Christian Year, The, 183, 191.
Christianity, 257.
Christopher, S., 30.
Church, the, 3, 15, 21, 39, 45, 70, 91, 253.
Church of England, 38, 53, 68-71, 80, 90, 93, 133, 145, 146, 192, 198, 272, 273.
Church, Eastern, 62, 101, 173, 208, 276, 277.
Church, Western, 25, 53.
Church, fabric of, 21, 22, 219, 231.
Church, unity of, 68.
Church, Dean, 19.
Circumcision, 162.
Cleophas, 268.
Coles, Mr., 101, 209.
Collect, the, 239.
Collins, Bishop, 81.
Commemorations, religious, 8, 19, 22, 23, 186.
Commission, Royal, the, 273, 283.
Communion, Order of the, 71, 134.
Communion, Holy, 166, 167.
daily, 98, 100, 101, 168, 169, 212, 262, 263.
early, 88, 89.
evening, 89.
effect of, 99.
fast before, 89, 90-2.
first, 189.
frequency of, 100, 101, 106.
of infants, 87.
of the sick, 281.
of the young, 86, 87.
private, 285.
regularity in, 110.
spiritual, 102, 212.
Concomitance, 52.
Confession, 124, 129, 130-6, 138, 238, 242, 243.
Consecration Prayer, the, 72, 75, 249-252.
Consubstantiation, 2, 67, 68, 69.
Contrition, 139, 140.
Corban, 137.
Corinthians, the, 74, 94.
Cranmer, 79.
Creed, the, 240.
Cross, the, 23, 116, 222.
Cross, Sacrifice of the, 154, 156, 157.
Cup, the grace of the, 53

Daniel, 21.
David, 126, 127, 165, 181, 182.
Dead, Prayers for the, 242, 253, 271-5, 279, 280; memory of, 260.
Death, 5, 16, 31, 47, 175, 274.
Declaration on the Holy Eucharist, 83, 84, 159, 160.
Delilah, 267.
Denison, Archdeacon, 83.
Detachment, 185, 260.
Devil, the, 30, 129, 184, 198.
Devotions, popular, 26, 101.
Direction, 135.
Dothan, 229.

Elements, oblation of, 74.
—— the Eucharistic, 193, 198.
Elijah, 118, 178.
Elisha, 229.
Enoch, 11.
Environment, 120, 126.
Epistle, the, 239.
Eucharist, the, 26, 28, 115, 143-6, 150, 158, 159, 245, 246.
Eucharistic Life, 105.

Evil, agents of, 29, 30.
Ezekiel, 166, 173.

Faith, 23, 177-283.
Faithful, the, 211, 212.
Fasting, 241.
Father, the, 44.
Feast, the, 185-8.
Flowers, 222.
Food, 42, 43, 46, 86, 88, 175, 183.
Forbes, Bishop, 76, 78, 79.
Freeman, Archdeacon, 67.
Freewill, 30, 161, 170, 182.
Frere, Father, 221.
Friendship, 107, 109, 111.
Fulham Conference, the, 4, 7-10.
Funerals, 262, 270, 271, 274.

Gabriel, 178.
Gentleness, 183, 184.
Gerontius, Dream of, 278.
Geste, Bishop, 77, 78.
Gibson, Bishop, 76, 79-81, 145, 146.
Girdle, the, 227, 228.
Gloria in Excelsis, 254, 255.
Goodness, 183, 239.
Gore, Bishop, 25, 65, 66, 150, 152, 153, 159, 160, 177, 208.
Gospel, the 184, 239.
Growth, 46, 47.

Habit, 139.
Hamilton, Bishop, 78, 82, 161, 163.
Heaven, 277.
Hebrews, Epistle to the, 160.
Hedley, Bishop, 63, 101, 102, 144, 147, 150, 222, 225, 226.
Heredity, 119, 120, 126.
Holinshed, 287.
Homilies, the, 81.
Hooker, 2, 3, 5, 41, 140, 164, 165, 174.
Horace, 216.
Humanity, the, of Christ, 194, 195.

Idolatry, 177, 192, 193, 196, 197, 199, 208.
Imagination, 184, 233, 234.
Imitatio Christi, 200, 201, 226, 227.
Immortality, 188, 258, 272.
Incarnation, the, 11, 20, 26, 29, 33, 67, 176, 197, 219, 257, 259.
Indulgences, 278.
Intention, 115, 116, 117, 120.
Intercession, 117, 118, 119, 142, 170, 171, 200, 201.
Invocation, Eucharistic, the, 252.
Irenæus, 194.
Isaac, 186, 187, 249.
Isaiah, 247.

Jacob, 186, 187, 255.
James, S., 268.
James I., king, 194.
Jesus Christ, 26-28, 198, 221.
Jews, tradition of, 279.
—— 12-17, 35, 38, 40.
John, S., 33, 34, 39, 106, 107, 108, 114, 172, 184, 185, 244, 256.
John, S., the Baptist, 113, 116, 257.
Joseph, S., 255, 268.
Joy, 51, 52, 54, 245.
Judas, 112.
Judgment, Particular, 277.
Jus Liturgicum, 262.

Keble, Mr., 9, 10, 22, 60, 101, 102, 154, 164, 191, 197, 200, 202, 231.

Laodicea, Council of, 284.
Lateran Council, Fourth, 63, 132, 133.
Law, the, 189.
Lazarus, 188.
Legality, 203, 204.
Legg-Wickham, Dr., 90, 92.
Leibnitz, 282.
Leo IV., 284.
Levitical Services, 17, 18, 152, 153, 155, 156, 172, 236.
Liddon, Dr., 82, 83, 95, 96.
Lightfoot, Bishop, 95.
Lights, 222.
Liturgies, 191, 217, 231, 242, 251, 273, 279.
Long-suffering, 183, 184.
Love, 182, 184.
Luckock, Dr., 72, 75, 85, 153, 155, 172, 173.
Luke, S., 108.
Luther, 67, 68.

Mackonochie, Mr., 83.
Magi, the, 193, 210.
Maniple, the, 228.
Manna, the type of, 84 and *ff.*, 105.
Marriage, 263-6, 269.
Martha and Mary, 112, 182.
Matthew, S., 108, 112, 244.
Maundy Thursday, 36, 67, 109, 242, 243.
Mediation, 39-41, 221.
Meekness, 183.
Melchisedek, 148, 152.
Meroz, 112.
Midianites, 287, 288.
Milligan, Dr., 166, 167, 208, 211, 213.
μνημόσυνον, 161.
Moberly, Bishop, 68, 69, 82.
Moses, 11, 178, 193, 236, 251.
Moule, Bishop, 229, 231.
Mozarabic Rite, 231.
Mozley, Dr., 65, 71.
Mutiny, Indian, 223.
Myers, 113.
Mystery, 95, 190.

Nathan, 126, 127.
Nazianzen, 194.
Neale, Dr., 230, 231.
Newbolt and Stone, 70.
Newbolt, 71, 86, 119, 124, 133, 146, 208, 215.
Newman, Cardinal, 96, 97, 194, 195, 241, 266.
Nicæa, Canons of, 163.
Nicodemus, 109.
Non-communicating attendance, 102, 200-4, 206, 207, 209, 212, 213, 262, 284, 285, 287.
Nuptial Eucharist, 262-5, 267, 269.

Oberammergau, 150.
Objective and subjective, 56.
Oblation, 74, 75, 157, 167, 169, 205, 241, 242, 253, 278.
Offertory, the, 241.
Orarium, 228.
Ordination Service, 131.
Overall, Bishop, 71.
Oxenham, 152, 154.

Parables of our Lord:—
- Marriage Feast, the, 185.
- Pharisee and Publican, the, 256, 257.
- Prodigal son, the, 172.
- Talents, the, 181.
- Unjust Steward, the, 187.

Paradisus Animæ, 201.
Paschal Lamb, the, 164, 172.
Paschasius, Radbert, 158.

Passion, the, 172, 232.
Passion Music, Bach's, 150.
Patience, 11, 13.
Paul, S., 42, 118, 244, 270, 272.
Peace, 172, 182, 184, 256.
Penance, 140.
Penitential system, ancient, 206, 207.
Perreyve, Henri, 281, 282.
Peter, S., 232, 243, 269.
Picart, 232.
ποιεῖν, 160.
Prayer Book, 38, 71-3, 104, 122-5, 130, 132, 168, 169, 170, 171, 174, 208, 227, 252, 253, 270.
—— of 1549, 270, 283, 284.
—— of 1552, 200, 271, 284.
—— of 1662, 284.
Prayer, the Lord's, 186, 237, 238, 253.
Preparation, 104 and *ff.*, 122 and *ff.*, 237.
Presbyterians, 208.
Presence of God, 11 and *ff.*, 28, 29, 31, 188.
Presence, Sacramental, manner of, 55 and *ff*,
Presence, Virtual, 60.
Privy Council, judicial committee of, 192.
Probation, 278,
Proportion, 6, 27, 276.
Psalms, the, 12, 17, 19, 20, 28, 38, 187.
Pullan, Mr., 76, 283, 286.
Puller, Father, 90, 92, 158.
Purgatory, 272, 273, 275-9.
Puritans, 203.
Purity, 184.
Pusey, Dr., 68, 80, 83, 92, 163, 192, 194, 199, 269.

Rainbow, the, 162.
Receptionist theory of Sacramental Presence, 59.
Reformation, 46, 71, 81, 133, 222, 261.
Religion, 15, 16.
Reservation, 205, 283, 284.
Reserve, 202, 231, 247.
Reverence, 247.
Ridley, 79.
Ritual, 215 and *ff.*
Roman Catholicism, 101, 133, 150, 198, 199, 209, 273, 276.
Rubric, Black, the, 75, 76, 199.
Rubric, Ornaments, the, 203, 204.
Rubrics, 74, 75, 105, 217, 218, 221, 223, 262, 263, 285, 286.

Sacraments, 40, 41, 51.
Sacrifice, 145, 147, 151, 153.
Sacrifice, Eucharistic, the, 143 and *ff.*
Saintly life, 175, 176, 179, 180-5.
Saints, Communion of, 186, 187, 220.
Samson, 267.
Saul, 113.
Scrupulosity, 129, 130, 184, 244.
Scudamore, 163, 164, 168, 221, 226.
Self-examination, 125-9.
Shakespeare, 197.
Shechinah, 12, 25, 193, 287.
Shewbread, the, 162.
Sickness, 282.
Sin, 17, 19, 135, 141.
Sin, forgiveness of, 132, 138.
Spirit, the Fruit of, 182.
Spiritualism, 288.
State, future, 16.
State, intermediate, the, 272, 275, 278.
Stole, the, 238.

Stone, 65, 87.
Stow, 286.
Strength, 47-51.
Substance, 64-6, 68.
Symbolism, 220, 223, 225.

Tabernacle, 195, 199.
Table, 173 and *ff.*, 239.
Taylor, Jeremy, 91.
Temperance, 183, 185.
Tertullian, 171.
Thanksgiving, 254.
Theophanies, 193.
Thirlwall, Bishop, 69.
Toledo, Council of, 284.
Tracts for the Times, 76.
Tradition, 217, 218, 220.
Transfiguration, the, 20, 110, 180.
Transubstantiation, 2, 61-6, 68, 69, 79, 83, 84, 143, 144, 190.
Trent, Council of, 63, 76, 146, 148, 149, 276.
Trumpets, Feast of, 162, 163.

Ubiquitism, 199.
Undenominationalism, 3, 49.
Unity, 288.

Vestments, 115, 169, 223 and *ff.*
Viaticum, the, 285, 286.

Westcott, Bishop, 37.
Wicked, the Communion of, 8, 9, 73, 74, 79, 80.
Wilberforce, Archdeacon, R. I., 37, 68, 151, 154, 163, 168, 199.
Willis, 156.
Words, sacrificial, 163.
Wordsworth, Christopher, Bishop 160.
Worship, 32, 215, 218.

York Manual, 285.

Zacchæus, 211.
Zacharias, 178.
Zeal, 111-13.
Zwingli, 41, 58, 59.

INDEX OF PASSAGES IN HOLY SCRIPTURE REFERRED TO.

	PAGE
Acts iv. 13,	268
1 Corinthians x-xi.,	94
x-xi. 21,	174
xi. 21,	163
xi. 23, R.V.	95
xi. 26,	160
xi. 28,	125
xiii. 12,	261
Corinthians v. 17,	45
x. 31,	181
Colossians i. 26,	95
Daniel i. 5,	190
Ecclesiastes, i. 7,	110
xii. 1,	89
Ecclesiasticus iv. 17,	31
iv. 21,	137
xxiv. 20, 21,	38
Ephesians ii. 14,	172
iv. 4,	99
vi. 12,	49
Exodus x. 26,	236
xvi. 26,	85
xvi. 4,	97
xvi. 15,	93
xvi. 18,	105
xvi. 21,	88
xvii. 12,	116
xxxiii. 2,	178
Ezekiel xli. 22,	173
xliv. 16,	173
Ezekiel xlvii. 5,	178
xlvii. 12,	172
xl., xlviii.,	166
Galatians ii. 20,	42
Genesis ii. 20,	189
iii. 8,	22
iv. 3,	153
ix. 16,	162
xiv. 18,	152
xxii. 7-8,	249
xxviii. 16,	94
xlviii. 15,	285
Hebrews viii. 3,	154
ix. 12-7-25,	156
x. 7,	155
x. 12,	154
xi. 4,	153
xi. 6,	178
xi. 6,	240
xii. 22-23,	45
xii. 22-23,	187
xiii. 8,	261
xiii. 10,	143
Isaiah iv. 5,	255
vi.,	246
xxv. 4,	50
xlv. 5,	261
xlv. 15,	247
lxiii. 3,	108
S. James i. 18,	176

	PAGE
S. James i. 23-24,	129
Jeremiah xxix. 7,	239
xxxiii. 15-17-18,	165
Job ix. 2,	27
S. John, i. 1,	108
i. 12,	106
i. 16,	105
i. 29,	156
iii. 2,	261
vi. 16-21,	94
vi. 33,	109
vi. 58,	260
vi. 67,	108
viii. 11,	132
ix. 25,	214
x. 10,	43
xiii. 1-17,	244
xiv. 6,	27
xiv. 8,	180
xv. 11,	52
xvi. 12,	108
xix. 30,	156
xx. 22-23,	109
xx. 22-23,	131
xxi. 25,	109
Judges v. 23,	112
1 Kings xvii. 1,	12
xviii. 15,	178
xix. 7,	181
2 Kings iv. 34,	189
xiii. 16,	190
xvii. 27,	258
Leviticus i. 3,	155
i. 5,	156
i. 7-17,	153
iii. 2-13,	156
v. 5,	156
vi. 26-7, 3-6, 11,	153
vii. 18,	153
xvi. 14,	156
xvii. 6,	156
xxiv. 7,	162

	PAGE
S. Luke, i. 19,	178
iii. 10-14,	257
iv. 1,	256
vii. 36,	100
ix. 32,	180
xi. 9,	117
xiv. 16,	187
xvi. 9,	185
xvii. 5,	180
xvii. 17-18,	254
xviii. 14,	256
xx. 19.	160
xx. 38,	242
xxii. 19-20, R.V.,	58
xxii. 45,	180
Malachi i. 7-12,	173
i. 11,	165
iii. 34,	166
S. Mark v. 18-19,	257
vii. 18,	108
viii. 3,	283
viii. 21,	108
xiv. 22-3, R.V.,	57
S. Matthew ii. 2,	141
vi. 32,	44
viii. 2,	18
xviii. 14,	44
xxii. 2,	185
xxv. 20,	112
xxvi. 26-8, R.V.,	57
xxviii. 19, R.V.,	109
Numbers vi. 22,	255
x. 10,	162
S. Peter, ii. 2, 3,	175
iii. 18,	156
Proverbs ix. 5,	38
xxv. 13,	239
xxv. 25,	239
Psalms iv. 5,	186
xix. 10,	38
xxxv. 18,	187
xxxviii. 2,	196

	PAGE		PAGE
Psalms xxxix. 11, . .	50	Revelation iii. 2, . .	247
xlii. 2, . .	12	iii. 2, . .	256
lxiii. 1, . .	89	v. 6, . .	249
lxxv. 2, . .	19	xix. 9, . .	185
xcii. 13, . .	172	xix. 9, . .	261
ci. 3, . .	89	Romans, viii. 32, . .	115
cxix. 74, . .	268	viii. 32, . .	251
cxix. 103, . .	38	xi. 25 . .	96
cxxvii. 5, . .	171	2 Samuel i. 18, . .	171
Revelation i. 13, . .	227	2 Thessalonians iii. 5, .	113

Printed by T. and A. CONSTABLE, Printers to His Majesty
at the Edinburgh University Press

The Oxford Library of Practical Theology

Edited by the Rev. W. C. E. Newbolt, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's; and the Rev. Darwell Stone, M.A., Librarian of the Pusey House, Oxford.

Price 5s. each volume.

RELIGION. By the Rev. W. C. E. Newbolt, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's.

'*The Oxford Library of Practical Theology* makes a good beginning with Canon Newbolt's volume on religion. . . . The publishers have spared no pains in making the appearance of the volumes as attractive as possible. The binding, type, and general "get up" of the volume just issued leave nothing to be desired.'—*Guardian.*

HOLY BAPTISM. By the Rev. Darwell Stone, M.A., Librarian of the Pusey House, Oxford.

'Few books on Baptism contain more thoughtful and useful instruction on the rite, and we give Mr. Stone's effort our highest approval. It might well be made a text-book for candidates for the diaconate, or at least in theological colleges. As a book for thoughtful laymen it is also certain to find a place.' -*Church Times.*

CONFIRMATION. By the Right Rev. A. C. A. Hall, D.D., Bishop of Vermont.

'To the parochial clergy this volume may be warmly commended. They will find it to be a storehouse of material for their instruction, and quite the best treatise that we have on the subject it treats. It is thoroughly practical, and gives exactly the kind of teaching that is wanted.'—*Guardian.*

THE HISTORY OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER. By the Rev. Leighton Pullan, M.A., Fellow of St. John Baptist's College, Oxford.

'Mr. Pullan's book will no doubt have, as it deserves to have, a large number of readers, and they will gain a great deal from the perusal of it. It may be certainly recommended to the ordinary layman as by far the best book on the subject available.'—*Pilot.*

HOLY MATRIMONY. By the Rev. W. J. Knox Little, M.A., Canon of Worcester.

'Canon Knox Little has given us a most exhaustive treatise on Holy Matrimony written in his best and happiest style, and giving ample proofs of wide research and deep study of the various aspects, and the essential characteristics of Christian marriage. . . . We would strongly advise the clergy to place this work upon their shelves as a book of reference, while it forms a complete manual of instruction to aid them in the preparation of addresses on the subject.'—*Church Bells.*

THE INCARNATION. By the Rev. H. V. S. Eck, M.A., Rector of St. Matthew's, Bethnal Green.

'The teaching is sound, and the book may be placed with confidence in the hands of candidates for Orders or of intelligent and educated lay people who desire fuller instruction on the central doctrines of the Faith than can be provided in sermons.'—*Guardian.*

FOREIGN MISSIONS. By the Right Rev. E. T. Churton, D.D., formerly Bishop of Nassau.

'We welcome Bishop Churton's book as an authoritative exposition of the modern High Church view of Missions. It is good for us all to understand it, thereby we shall be saved alike from uninstructed admiration and indiscriminate denunciation.'—*Church Missionary Intelligencer.*

PRAYER. By the Rev. Arthur John Worlledge, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of Truro.

'We do not know of any book about prayer which is equally useful; and we anticipate that it will be a standard work for, at any rate, a considerable time.'—*Pilot.*

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
LONDON, NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA

SUNDAY. By the Rev. W. B. TREVELYAN, M.A., Warden of the Liddon House.

'An extremely useful contribution to a difficult and important subject, and we are confident it will rank high in the series to which it belongs.'—*Guardian.*

THE CHRISTIAN TRADITION. By the Rev. LEIGHTON PULLAN, M.A., Fellow of St. John Baptist's College, Oxford.

*** *This book contains an account of the origin of Episcopacy, the three Creeds, the Ancient Western Liturgies and other institutions of the Church. Special attention is also given to the early history of Sacramental Confession and to the principle of Authority in the Church of England.*

BOOKS OF DEVOTION. By the Rev. CHARLES BODINGTON, Canon and Precentor of Lichfield.

'Extremely valuable for its high tone, fidelity to Catholic standards, and powerful advocacy of reality in private devotion. To those who have never studied the subject, it should reveal a mine of devotional wealth yet to be worked with profit to man and glory to God.'—*Church Times.*

HOLY ORDERS. By the Rev. A. R. WHITHAM, M.A., Principal of Culham College, Abingdon.

'For the educated layman who wishes to know what the Church is teaching about the ministry, and what the relation of the laity to it really is, this is the best book with which we have met.'—*Pilot.*

THE CHURCH CATECHISM THE CHRISTIAN'S MANUAL. By the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's.

'We think the book should be in the possession of every teacher who can afford it, and in every Church Library for the benefit of those who cannot.'—*Reader and Layworker.*

THE HOLY COMMUNION. By the Rev. DARWELL STONE, M.A., Librarian of the Pusey House, Oxford.

'The book meets a distinct want, and is indispensable to all who desire to have a concise and well-balanced summary of the different opinions which have been held with regard to the Holy Communion from the earliest days of the Church.'—*Oxford Diocesan Magazine.*

CHURCH WORK. By the Rev. BERNARD REYNOLDS, M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's.

'What is needed is a brightly written and sensible book which will suggest topics for consideration and the way in which a Christian should view them. The book before us fulfils these conditions. It is stimulating and suggestive and that is exactly what is wanted.'—*Guardian.*

CHURCH AND STATE IN ENGLAND. By the Rev. W. H. ABRAHAM, D.D., late Vicar of St. Augustine's, Hull.

OUR LORD'S RESURRECTION. By the Rev. W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, M.A., of St. Mary's Hospital, Ilford.

THE PRINCIPLES OF RELIGIOUS CEREMONIAL. By the Rev. WALTER HOWARD FRERE, M.A., of the Community of the Resurrection.

THE ATONEMENT. By the Rev. LEIGHTON PULLAN, M.A., Fellow of St. John Baptist's College, Oxford.

SIN. By the Rev. H. V. S. ECK, M.A., Rector of St. Matthew's, Bethnal Green.

THE SACRAMENT OF THE ALTAR. By the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
LONDON, NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA

40
net